Imprimatur.

Carolus Alſton R. P. D. Hen. Epiſc. Lond. à Sacris Domeſticis.

rch 1.
68§.

Imprimatur.

Carolus Alſton R. P. D. Hen. Epiſc. Lond. à Sacris Domeſticis.

rch 1.
68§.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE Church of England,

IN THE

Several ARTICLES propoſed by

Monſieur de *MEAUX*,

Late Biſhop of Condom,

IN HIS

EXPOSITION of the DOCTRINE

OF THE

Catholick Church.

To which is prefix'd a particular account of *Monſieur de Meaux*'s Book.

William Wake, D.D.

The Third Edition.

LONDON,

Printed for **Richard Chiſwell**, at the *Roſe* and *Crown* in S. *Paul*'s Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVII.

THE PREFACE.

THE *ſmalneſs of this Treatiſe would hardly juſtifie the ſolemnity of a Preface, but that it might be thought too great a rudeneſs to paſs without ſome* Ceremony *upon a* Book, *which both the Merit and Character of the Author, and the Quality of thoſe Approbations he has prefix'd to it, may juſtly ſeem to have fenced from all vulgar attempts, as Sacred and inviolable. It may perhaps be ſome ſatisfaction to the Reader too to know, how it is come to paſs that a Meer* Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, *pretending to contain nothing but what they have always profeſſed, and in their Council of* Trent *plainly declared to be their Doctrine; ſhould nevertheleſs have become ſo conſiderable, as not only to be approved by many Perſons of the greateſt Eminency in that* Church, *but even to be recommended by the whole body of the* Clergy *of* France *in their Aſſembly* 1682; *and whereever it has come, done ſo many Miracles, as not only common report ſpeaks, but even the* Advertiſement *it ſelf prefixed to it, takes care to tell us that it has.* Method. 10.

The first design of Monsieur de Meaux's *Book was either to satisfie or to seduce the late* Mareschal de Turenne. *How far it contributed thereunto I am not able to say; but am willing to believe that the change that honourable Person made of his Religion, was upon some better grounds than the bare* Exposition *of a few Articles of the Roman Faith; and that the Author supplied either in his personal Conferences with him, or by some other Papers to us unknown, what was wanting to the first draught which we have seen of this.*

The Manuscript Copy *which then appeared, and for about four Years together passed up and down in private hands with great applause, wanted all those Chapters of* the Eucharist, Tradition, The Authority of the Church and Pope, *which now make up the most considerable part of it; and in the other points which it handled, seemed so loosly and favourably to propose the Opinions of the Church of* Rome, *that not only many undesigning Persons of that Communion were offended at it, but the Protestants who saw it, generally believed that* Monsieur de Meaux *durst not* publickly *own, what in his* Exposition *he* privately *pretended to be their Doctrine.*

And the Event shew'd that they were not altogether mistaken. For in the beginning of the Year 1671 the Exposition *being with great care, and after the consideration of many years reduced into the form in which we now see it; and to secure all, fortified with the Approbation of the Archbishop of* Reims *and nine other Bishops, who profess that* 'Having examined it with 'all the Care which the importance of the matter 'required, they found it conformable to the Do-'ctrine of the Church, and as such recommended it

'to

'to the People which God had committed to their 'conduct, *it was ſent to the Preſs. The impreſſion being finiſh'd and juſt ready to come abroad; the Author, who deſired to appear with all the Advantage to himſelf and his Cauſe that was poſſible, ſent it to ſome of the Doctors of the* Sorbonne *for their Approbation to be joyn'd to that of the Biſhops, that ſo no Authority, ordinary or extraordinary, might be wanting to aſſert the Doctrine contained in it, to be ſo far from the ſuſpition the Proteſtants had conceived of it, that it was truly and without diſguiſe* Catholick, Apoſtolick, and Roman.

But to the great ſurpriſe of Monſieur de Meaux, *and thoſe who had ſo much cry'd up his Treatiſe before, the* Doctors *of the* Sorbonne *to whom it was communicated, inſtead of the* Approbation *that was expected, confirmed what the Proteſtants had ſaid of it; and, as became their faculty, marked ſeveral of the moſt conſiderable parts of it, wherein* the Expoſition *by the too great deſire of palliating, had abſolutely perverted the Doctrine of their Church.*

To prevent the open Scandal which ſuch a Cenſure *might have cauſed, with great Induſtry, and all the Secrecy poſſible, the whole* Edition *was ſuppreſſed, and the ſeveral places which the* Doctors *had marked changed; and the Copy ſo ſpeedily ſent back to the Preſs again, that in the end of the ſame year another much altered was publickly expoſed, as the* firſt Impreſſion *that had at all been made of it.*

Yet this could not be ſo privately carry'd, but that it ſoon came to a publick knowledge; inſomuch that one of the firſt Anſwers that was made to it, charged Monſieur de Meaux *with this change. I do not hear that he has ever yet thought fit to deny the Relation, either*

ther in the Advertiſement *prefixed to the later Editions of his Book, wherein yet he replies to ſome other paſſages of the ſame Treatiſe, or in any other Vindication; Whether it be that ſuch an imputation was not conſiderable enough to be taken notice of, or that it was too true to be deny'd, let the Reader judge. But certainly it appears to us not only to give a clear account of the Deſign and Genius of the whole Book; but to be a plain demonſtration, how improbable ſoever* Monſieur de Meaux *would repreſent it,* 'That it is not impoſſible 'for a Biſhop of the Church of *Rome*, either not to be 'ſufficiently inſtructed in his Religion to know 'what is the Doctrine of it; or not ſufficiently ſin-'cere, as without diſguiſe to repreſent it. *And ſince a Copy of that very Book ſo marked, as has been ſaid, by the* Doctors *of the* Sorbonne *is fallen into my hands, I ſhall gratifie the* * *Readers curioſity with a particular view of ſome of the Changes that have been made, that ſo he may judge* whether of the Two *were the Cauſe of thoſe great advances, which the Author in that firſt Edition had thought fit to make towards us.*

Advertiſement Pag. 1.

* See the Collection at the end of the Preface.

It might perhaps appear a very pardonable curioſity in us, after the knowledge we have had of the firſt miſcarriage of this Book at the Sorbonne, *to enquire how it comes to paſs, that among ſo many* other Approbations *as have with great Induſtry been procured to the later Editions of it, we do not yet ſee* any ſubſcription of theirs *to it, even now.* Monſieur de Meaux *could not certainly be ignorant of what weight the Cenſure of that Learned Faculty is with us; and that ſuch an* Approbation *might not only have been more eaſily obtained, but would alſo more effectually have wiped away the blot caſt upon his Book by their former refuſal, than all the Letters*

and

and Complements that could come from the other ſide the Mountains, and which France *it ſelf hath taught us, in matters more conſiderable than this, not to have too high a Value for: Nor can we ſuppoſe any thing elſe, than that the fear of a* further Correction *kept it from being any more ſubmitted to their* Cenſure; *and that the Author would rather paſs without the Honour of their* Approbation, *than run the hazard of a ſecond Refuſal.*

But for this, becauſe we cannot ſpeak any thing certain, we will not purſue our Conjectures. Certain it is that whatever the judgement of the Sorbonne *would now have been of it, many of the Church of* Rome *were ſtill diſſatisfied with it.* * *And how improbable ſoever* Monſieur de Meaux *would have us think what one of his Anſwerers affirms, that a Papiſt ſhould have written againſt him; Yet not only the confeſſed ſincerity of* Monſieur Conrart *who often declared that he had ſeen it, but the undoubted integrity of* ſome others *by whom I have been aſſured that they had it, in their hands, obliges me to joyn in the aſſertion, that* Monſieur M——, *one of the Roman Communion had finiſh'd an Anſwer to it, before any of the Proteſtants were publiſhed however upon ſome certain Conſiderations it was thought fit to ſuppreſs it.*

* See his Advertiſement.

It will perhaps be looked upon, that this confirmation of that Manuſcript Anſwer deſerves as little aſſent, as Monſieur de Meaux *has thought fit to give to* Monſieur de la B---'s *firſt Aſſertion of it. And therefore to ſhew that it is not impoſſible, nor indeed very improbable, that Papiſts ſhould write one againſt another; and that the Method of the* Expoſition, *how plauſible ſoever to deceive Proteſtants, has nevertheleſs offended the ſincere and Undeſigning of the other Commu-*

nion; I will beg leave to produce two or three undeny-able Witneſſes upon ſome of the firſt and chiefeſt Points of it; and which though not written purpoſe-ly againſt it, yet I am perſwaded, Monſieur de Meaux *himſelf will be ſo juſt as to confeſs, that he cannot be altogether unconcerned in them.*

For his firſt Point, The Invocation of Saints; *The great moderation of the* Expoſition *tells us on-ly,* 'That it is uſeful to pray to them, and that 'we ought to do it in the ſame Spirit of Charity, 'and in the ſame Order of Brotherly Society with 'which we intreat our Friends on Earth to pray for 'us: that all the Prayers of the Church howſoever 'they may be worded, yet muſt ſtill be underſtood to 'be reduced to this form, PRAY FOR US.

Now what Monſieur de Meaux *here ſays in ge-neral concerning the* Invocation of Saints, *another Tract Printed about the ſame time at* Cologne, *and intituled* Salutary Advertiſements of the Bleſſed Virgin, to her indiſcreet Adorers; *Particularly ap-plied to that Service, which with ſo much ſuperſtiti-on is paid in the Church of* Rome *to the Mother of Chriſt.*

[*Avis ſalu-taires de la bien heureuſe Vierge à ſes Devots indiſcrets.* This Tract was publiſh'd firſt at *Gand* in *Latin*, by *Monſieur Widenfelt* a *German*, Intendant of the Affairs of the Prince of *Sarr-embourg*; afterwards Tranſlated into *French*, and now ſince the firſt Edition of this Expoſi-tion into *Engliſh*.]

The Book is every where full of Expreſſions of Ho-nour and Reſpect for her; and only ſpeaks againſt that Worſhip which Monſieur de Meaux *here de-clares in the name of the* Council of Trent *to be none of theirs. It was ſent abroad into the World with all the Advantage imaginable:- It had the* Ap-probation *of the Biſhop of* Myſia, *Suffragan to the Archbiſhop of* Cologne; *of the Vicar General of the*

the place; *of the Cenſure of* Gant; *of the Canons and Divines of* Malines; *of the Univerſity of* Louvain; *and Laſtly of Monſieur the Biſhop of* Tournay, *who recommended it as a Treatiſe* 'full of ſo-'lid Piety, and very fit and neceſſary to draw Peo-'ple out of thoſe Errours and Abuſes into which their 'Superſtition had led them.

Yet notwithſtanding all this Applauſe, if we enquire what ſucceſs this Book had with others, Father Craſſet the Jeſuit, *who wrote purpoſely againſt it,* * *his Book Printed at* Paris 1679. *Licenſed by the Provincial, approved by the three Fathers of the Society appointed to examine it, and Laſtly, authorized by the King's Permiſſion, tells us,* † 'That for fear 'of giving Scandal to Hereticks, he had given a 'very great one to *(thoſe he calls)* Catholicks: 'That the Learned Men of all Nations had writ-'ten againſt him; that the Holy See had con-'demn'd him; *Spain* had baniſh'd him out of its 'Dominions, and forbid to Read or Print his Book, 'as containing Propoſitions ſuſpected of Errour 'and Impiety, that abuſed the Holy Scripture, 'and impoſed upon Catholicks, by taking them off 'from the Piety and Devotion due to the Mother of 'God; In a word, from the general Invocation of 'Saints and Worſhip of Images.

* See his Book entituled *La veritable devotion envers la Ste. Vierge.* 4°.

† *La Preface* p. 1, 2.

I ſhall not need to ſay how far the Fathers Zeal carries him in the Anſwer it ſelf: It is evident that what Monſieur de Meaux *tells us, is only* Uſeful, *the Jeſuit declares to be* 'abſolutely Neceſſa-'ry: That we are indiſpenſably obliged to pray to 'her: That it is the intention of God, that we 'ſhould obtain both Grace and Glory by her; 'That all Men ſhould be ſaved by the Merits

Pag. 31, &c.

'of the Son, and the Interceſſion of the Mother, 'and that foraſmuch therefore as God has reſolved 'not to give any Grace but what paſſes through the 'Hands of *Mary*; as we cannot be ſaved without 'Grace, ſo it muſt be confeſſed that we cannot be 'ſaved without her. *This is I preſume ſomewhat more than what* Monſieur de Meaux *expounds to us*; *and I ſhall leave it to any one to judge whether this Father and his Approvers who have ſhew'd themſelves ſo zealous againſt the Author* of the Bleſſed Virgins Salutary Advertiſements, *could have been very well pleaſed with* Monſieur de Meaux's Expoſition.

The next Point which the Expoſition advances, is concerning The Worſhip of Images, Monſieur de Meaux *in the Edition ſuppreſſed, affirmed*, 'That the 'Church of *Rome* does not ſo much honour the 'Image of the Apoſtle or Martyr, as the Apoſtle or 'Martyr in preſence of the Image. *And though the 'Cenſure paſſed upon this new fancy, obliged him to ſpeak 'a little more plainly, yet is it only thus, even now*, That 'when the Church pays an Honour to the Image of 'an Apoſtle or Martyr, her intention is not ſo much 'to honour the Image, as to honour the Apoſtle or 'Martyr in preſence of the Image.

See the Collection at the end of the Preface. n. II.

Concerning which the Reader may pleaſe to obſerve, that Cardinal Capiſucchi *one of the* Approvers *of* Monſieur de Meaux's Expoſition, *has lately ſet forth a Volume of Controverſies at* Rome, *with all the moſt ſolemn Permiſſions and Approbations that can be deſired, in which he formally contradicts the Doctrine of the ſame* Expoſition *in this Point*; *and concludes*, 'That the Church in the Councils of '*Nice* and *Trent* forbids only ſuch a Divine Ho- 'nour to Images as is Idolatrous, *i. e.* ſays he, 'which

Art. 8. p. 647.

'which is paid to Images in and for themſelves; 'and by which the Image is worſhipped, as if ſome 'God or Divinity were contained in it. But for that 'Divine Worſhip which is paid to the Images of the 'Holy Trinity, of our Saviour Chriſt and the Holy 'Croſs, upon the account of the things repreſented 'by them, and as they are in that reſpect one and 'the ſame with the thing which they repreſent, and 'aſcribes not any Divinity to the Images, there ne-'ver was, nor can be any diſpute of it.

Monſieur de Meaux *may pleaſe to conſider whether this be not ſufficiently contrary to the Doctrine* Expounded *by Him*; *and how we are to reconcile the Controverſies of the* Cardinal Capiſucchi, *with the Letter and Approbation of the* * Maſter of the Sacred Palace. *In the meantime I will beg leave to add one inſtance more, that is nigher home, and I think ſtill at this time depending*; *and which the particular intereſt* Monſieur de Meaux *has, more ways than one, had in it*; *will I ſuppoſe undoubtedly ſatisfie him, that notwithſtanding the* Aſſembly of the Clergy *have recommended ſo much both his Book and his Method, all nevertheleſs at this day are not very well ſatisfied, even in* France *it ſelf, either with the one or other.*

* So he was when he wrote to *Monſieur de Meaux.*

'Monſieur † Imbert *Prieſt and Doctor of Divinity 'in the Province of* Bourdeaux *was not long ſince accus'd, 'that upon* Good Fryday *before he proceeded to the 'ſolemn ſervice of that day, which conſiſts chiefly in the* 'Adoration of the Croſs; *He turned to the People, 'and taking occaſion from the raſhneſs of ſome of the* Fa-'thers of the Miſſion *whom he had with grief heard 'maintain,* That the Croſs was to be adored after 'the very ſame manner as Jeſus Chriſt in the Sa-'crament of the Euchariſt; *profeſs'd to them that*

† The whole of this is taken out of the *Factum* which he printed of his Caſe.

'he

'*he could not enter on the ſervice of that day with-*
'*out declaring truly to them what the real Doctrine*
'*of the Church as to this point was. That the*
'*Church deſigned not that* we ſhould adore the Croſs
'which we ſee, *but that we ſhould* adore Jeſus Chriſt
'whom we do not ſee. *That there was a great*
'*difference between the* Croſs *and* the Holy Sacra-
'ment; *That in this our Saviour Chriſt was really pre-*
'*ſent, whereas that was only a ſimple figure or repreſen-*
'*tation of him.*

'*This was his Accuſation, and he confeſſed that his*
'*Opinion was, That the Church* adored not the Croſs,
'*and that the contrary Opinion was not only* falſe
'*but* Idolatrous. *That not only the Proteſtants*
'*made their advantage of thoſe who maintain'd*
'*ſuch Errours, but that he himſelf was ſcandali-*
'*zed to converſe every day with the Miſſionaries*
'*and others, whom he had openly heard preach a hun-*
'*dred times,* 'That we ought to adore the Croſs
'with Jeſus Chriſt, as the Humane nature of our
'Saviour with the Divine.

'*Being accuſed for this, he defended himſelf with*
'*all the ſtrength of Argument that he was able; yet*
'*being ſtill accounted a Heretick for it, he finally al-*
'*ledged in his defence,* 'That the Expoſition of *Mon-*
'*ſieur de Meaux* defended the very ſame; that he went
'upon his principles, whoſe Book was approved by
'the Pope and ſeveral Cardinals in *Italy*, by the
'Biſhops and Clergy of *France*, and others of the
'greateſt note in the Church of *Rome*.

'*Nevertheleſs he was ſuſpended in a manner grie-*
'*vous and extraordinary: He wrote to* Monſieur de
'Meaux *himſelf about it, who preſently ſent to the Arch-*
'*biſhop of* Bourdeaux *in his behalf*: *He addreſſed him-*
'*ſelf*

'ſelf beſides to many other the moſt conſiderable Perſons 'of the Kingdom; to Monſieur the Chancellour; to 'Monſieur de Chatteau-neuf; to the Intendant of the 'Province, only that he might have juſtice in a cauſe, 'which according to Monſieur de Meaux's principles, 'was certainly very favourable; But I do not hear that he has yet had any other Effect of all his ſupplications, and the intereſt of thoſe Honourable perſons in his behalf, than that they ſtill draw more and ſeverer menaces from his Judges, and threats either of perpetual Impriſonment, or even death it ſelf for his Offence.

After this clear conviction I may reaſonably hope it will appear no improbable matter to Monſieur de Meaux himſelf, either that one Papiſt ſhould have written againſt his Book, or that many others ſhould have expreſſed themſelves to be of a mind very different from the principles and opinions of it. Had it pleaſed him to have gratified the World with the ſight of Cardinal Buillon's and Monſieur l'Abbé de Dangeau's Letters to Cardinal Bona and Cardinal Chigi, as well as of their anſwers to them, they would perhaps have ſhewn, that not only the Proteſtants pretended ſuch oppoſitions of his own party to his Book, but that Monſieur de Meaux himſelf was not altogether unſenſible of it.

No ſooner was the firſt Impreſſion of the Expoſition which was permitted to paſs abroad, finiſh'd, but preſently a Copy was diſpatch'd to Rome, with Letters and commendations to prepare the way for its reception in that Court; and provide againſt thoſe faults which ſome it ſeems accuſed it of, if the Contradictors which

See the Advertiſement.

[Cardinal Bona's Letter: V. E. mi accenna che alcuni gli habbino trovato à dire, perche tutte le Opere grande, e che Sormontano l'Ordinario ſempre hanno Contradittori——Anſwer to Cardinal Buillon.

oppoſed it at home, ſhould think fit to purſue it thither.

It is not to be ſuppoſed that either the dignity of the Cardinal who ſent the Book, or of him to whom it was addreſs'd, would have permitted them in ſuch a manner to take notice of the faults *and* the Contradictors *which their Letters ſpeak of, had they not been both things, and Perſons worthy their conſideration. But much leſs would* Monſieur l'Abbé de Dangeau *have uſed his intereſt with* Cardinal Chigi *to gain the favour of the* Maſter of the Sacred Palace, *and of the* Congregation *del Indice*, if any one had or ſhould ſpeak againſt it, *had there been no cauſe to apprehend that any one would attempt either.*

See the Anſwer of Cardinal *Chigi* to *Monſieur l'Abbé de Dangeau*; [*Parlai al Padre Maeſtro di S. Palazzo, & al Secretario della congregatione dell' Indice, e connobbi Veramente che non vi era ſtato chi haveſſe à queſti padri parlato in diſfavore del medeſimo.*]

What other particular perſons were employ'd upon the like Offices, is a ſecret too cloſe for us to be able to penetrate. Only the Advertiſement it ſelf gives us cauſe to believe that great intereſt was made even by the French *Ambaſſador himſelf to his Holineſs about it*; *and that the few Letters we ſee ſet out with ſo much Induſtry both in the Originals and their Tranſlation, and the long Hiſtory of them in the Advertiſement, were the effects of a labour and intereſt, great as the long term of eight years that were ſpent in the procuring of them.*

See Advertiſement, &c.

The ſecond Anſwer of Monſieur de la B-- *to* Monſieur de Meaux *has ſo fully examined every one of theſe Approbations, and ſo plainly ſhew'd how ſmall account is to be made of them, that we do not find that in four years that it has been publiſh'd, any one has undertaken to reply to it. I will therefore only add in general a remark or two that may ſerve to inform thoſe of our own Country who are unacquainted with ſuch intrigues, what*

the

the Method of the Approbations of the Church of *Rome* is, and how little ſtreſs is to be laid upon them.

It is a long time ſince it has been reſolved by many of their Caſuiſts, that it is lawful to diſguiſe the ſentiments of their Religion, not only in private Conferences, but in the very Pulpit it ſelf, when there is a ſufficient reaſon for the doing of it. But I cannot tell whether it be yet ſo generally known that it is lawful for them to ſet their hands to, and approve thoſe Books whoſe Principles and Doctrine they diſlike, by an Art peculiar to themſelves, and which Proteſtants, who are uſed to ſincere dealing, will find it a little difficult to believe.

The inſtance of Cardinal Capiſucchi *before mentioned is an undeniable proof of this for* Italy; *Who about the ſame time that he ſent his Letter and Approbation to* Monſieur de Meaux *of his Expoſition, wrote, as we have ſeen, directly contrary to the Doctrine of it, and had his Book approved with no leſs ſolemnity at* Rome, *than* Monſieur de Meaux *can pretend his to have been. And for* France, *a Perſon very juſtly eſteemed both for his great Quality and his own worth,* Monſieur *the* Procureur General *of the Parliament of* Paris, *having clearly revealed the myſtery of it, I ſhall beg leave to repreſent it to the World, under the advantage of ſo great and unqueſtionable an Authority.*

Father Thomaſſin *about twenty years ſince printed a Book which he called* Notæ in Concilia; *the deſign whereof was to ſet up the Authority of the Pope above all Councils, which he renders in a manner uſeleſs to the deciſion of Eccleſiaſtical matters. The Copies of this Book were all ſeized, and lock'd up in a Chamber of the* Fathers Oratorians *at* Paris.

Ten or Twelve years after, with ſome changes to fill up the Leaves that had been cenſured, and the Approbation of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, *he again attempted to have it publiſh'd. But* Monſieur *the* Procurer General *oppoſed it, and told him that but in conſideration of Father* Harlay, *his near Relation, who interpoſed for him, he would have had his Book burnt by the hand of the common Hangman.*

The Father juſtified himſelf that his Book contained no other Principles than what were found in Cardinal Bellarmine's *Controverſies which* had been printed with authority, and were permitted to be every day publickly ſold in *France. The Procureur General replyed,* 'That they ſuffered in *France,* that 'an *Italian* ſhould write according to the Principles 'of his Country, and that this ought not to hinder 'but that a Book, otherwiſe good, might be pub-'lickly printed and ſold with priviledge; but that 'for a *Frenchman* to do the ſame, was another mat-'ter, and would have different conſequences: *and* '*that in ſhort,* The *Italians* uſed the ſame method 'towards them.

And indeed the late change of the Jeſuits *in their* Approbations *plainly ſhews, that it is permitted to thoſe of the Church of Rome* to write and approve not ſo much according to their own Opinions, as to the Principles and *Genius* of the Country in which they live. *For which reaſon the Fathers of the Society do no longer now, as formerly they were wont, take out their* Licence *from the* General of their Order, *but from their reſpective* Provincials; *who accommodate themſelves to the current Doctrine of the place in which the Book is publiſh'd; without which it would be almoſt impoſſible for them to write in* France, *but they ſhould be ſubject to the danger of a cenſure at* Rome. *After*

After this general account of the Nature of the Approbations of the Church of Rome, *I ſhall ſpare both my ſelf and Reader the trouble of examining the ſeveral Letters before the Expoſition, though otherwiſe they lie open to many exceptions; only concerning his* Holineſs's Brief, *which* Monſieur de Meaux *ſo much triumphs in, it may not be amiſs to obſerve, that the* laſt Pope, *in whoſe time the Expoſition came firſt to* Rome *with great Recommendation, yet* never gave any Approbation to it; *and that the preſent Pope did it* 'upon occaſion of † a ſub-'miſſive Letter of the Authors to him, and after 'the reports that he had heard of the great * Con-'verſions that were every where made by it, *to which ſuch an Approbation would be likely to add a new force. So plain is the intrigue and deſign of this, that were the Popes Briefs otherwiſe of as great conſideration, as the Papiſts themſelves ſhew them to be of little value, yet this could not be regarded by us, as any other than a meer Artifice to deceive us, not a* ſincere, *much leſs* authoritative Approbation *either of the Nature or Principles of* Monſieur de Meaux's *Book.*

† *L' Auteur---- fit avec un tres profond reſpect ſes tres humbles remercimens au Pape par une Lettre du 22. Nov.* 1678. *dont il receut reponſe par un Bref de ſa Saintetè du 4 Jan.* 79. Avertiſſ. And in the Brief it ſelf, *Devotionem interim atque Obſervantiam quam erga ſanctam hanc ſedem noſque ipſos qui in eâ Catholicæ Eccleſiæ præſidemus tuæ ad Nos Litteræ luculenter declarant, mutuæ charitatis affectu complectimur.*]

* The Biſhop of *Strasburgh* having accounted to his Holineſs his deſign of Tranſlating the Expoſition into the *German* Language, *Sa Saintetè lui fit dire qu'il connoiſſoit ce livre, & qu'on luy rapportoit detous coſtez qu'il faiſoit beaucoup de Converſions.* Avertiſſement.

But what ever the Opinion either of the Pope or Papiſts has been of this Expoſition, certain it is the Proteſtants have openly enough declared their thoughts concerning it; and the Expoſition according

Card. Bona's Letter.

to the fate of all other great and extraordinary things, *has found enough on this ſide to oppoſe it.*

It was but a very little time after the firſt Edition of it, that Monſieur Noguier *and another Author well known, yet whoſe name I ſpare, becauſe he has not thought fit himſelf to diſcover it, wrote againſt it; and with ſo much ſucceſs, that the Papiſts themſelves confeſt,* 'That it was an ill-Cauſe defended extremely well.

Monſieur de Turenne *not long before that laſt Campagne in which he loſt his Life, made great boaſts of a Reply that was ſpeedily to be publiſh'd to them; but after the long expectation of above eight Years, only* an Advertiſement *was prefix'd to a new Edition of the Book, which neither touches at all the greateſt part of the Exceptions that had been made againſt it, nor gives any ſatisfaction to thoſe it do's take notice of.*

It has been the conſtant method of Monſieur de Meaux, *having once written, to leave his Tracts to the World, and take no care to defend them againſt thoſe aſſaults, that ſeem with ſucceſs enough to have been ſometimes made upon them. We ſhould think the great Employments, in which he has had the Honour to be engaged, might have been the cauſe of this, did not he who takes no care to defend his old Books, find ſtill time enough to write new. Perhaps he looks upon his pieces to be of a Spirit and Force ſufficient to deſpiſe whatever attempts can be made upon them; but ſure he cannot be ignorant, that Proteſtants make another and far different Concluſion, and look upon* thoſe Opinions to be certainly indefenſible, which ſo able and eminent an Author is content ſo openly, and, if I may be permitted to add it, ſo ſhamefully to forſake.

What

What other Anſwers beſides thoſe I have now mentioned have been made to it, I cannot undertake to ſay; Two others only that I know of have been publiſh'd; the Author of the latter of which Monſieur de Brueys *having in a very little time after his writing left his Religion, might have made a new inſtance of* Monſieur de Meaux's *Conqueſts, did not his inability to anſwer his own arguments againſt the Expoſition, give us cauſe to believe, that ſome other Motives than thoſe of that Book induced him ſo* lightly *to forſake* a Cauſe, *which he had ſo* ſoundly *and generouſly defended.*

And now after ſo many Anſwers yet unreplied to, if any one deſires to know what the deſign of the preſent undertaking is, they may pleaſe to underſtand, that having by a long Converſe among the Papiſts of our own and others Countries perceived that either by the ignorance or malice of their Inſtructors, they have generally very falſe and imperfect Notions of our Opinions in the matters in Controverſie between us, I have ſuffered my ſelf to be perſwaded to purſue the Method of Monſieur de Meaux's *Expoſition as to the* Doctrine of the Church of England; *and oppoſe ſincerely to what he pretends is the Opinion of the Roman Church,* that form of Faith that is openly profeſs'd and taught without any diſguiſe or diſſimulation among us.

I was not unwilling to take the Method of Monſieur de Meaux *for my direction, as well upon the account of the great Reputation both of the Book and of the Author, as becauſe it is now ſome years that it has paſs'd in our Language without any anſwer that I know of made to it. Beſides, that the late new Impreſſion made*

of

of it, with all the advantages of the Advertiſement *and* Approbations, *which the later* French *Editions have added to it, ſeemed naturally to require ſome ſuch Conſideration.*

I do not pretend by any thing of this to treat Monſieur de Meaux *as an Enemy, but rather as both his great Learning, and that Character which I have ever learnt very highly to reverence, oblige me, to follow him as my Guide. To render an account to him and to the World what our differences are, and point out in paſſing ſome of thoſe reaſons that are the moſt uſually given amongſt us, wherefore we cannot totally aſſent to what he propoſes.*

I am perſwaded the whole is done with that Charity *and* Moderation, *that there is nothing in it that can juſtly offend the moſt zealous Enemy of our Church. If I knew of any thing in it that without diſſembling the Truth might have been omitted, I ſincerely profeſs I would moſt willingly have done it, being deſirous to pleaſe all, that ſo, if it be the will of God, I may by any means gain ſome.*

For this cauſe chiefly have I forborn to ſet my name to it, leſt perhaps any prejudice againſt my Perſon, might chance to injure the Excellence of the Cauſe which I maintain.

This effect at leaſt, if no other, I would willingly hope ſuch a Treatiſe may have upon thoſe of our Country that have been taught to believe very differently concerning us; That they would pleaſe no longer to form ſuch horrible Ideas of our Profeſſion as they have heretofrre been wont to do; at leaſt till it can be ſhewn that I have either palliated or prevaricated the

Doctrine

Doctrine of the Church of *England in this Exposition. Which I am yet ſo aſſured I have not done, that I here intirely ſubmit both my ſelf and it to her Cenſure; of whoſe Communion I eſteem it my greateſt Happineſs that I am, and for whoſe Preſervation and Enlargement I ſhall never ceaſe, as I ought, to pray.*

A Col-

A Collection of ſome of thoſe Paſſages that were corrected in the firſt Edition of the EXPOSITION *ſuppreſſed by* Monſieur de Meaux : *To which is added, the Cenſure of the Faculty of* Louvain, *upon ſome part of the Doctrine ſtill remaining in it.*

§. I.

MOnſieur *de Meaux* in the very beginning of his Book ſpeaking of the deſign of it, had theſe Words:

1. *Edit.*

" So that it ſeems then to be very proper to pro-
" poſe to them (the Proteſtants) the Doctrine
" of the Catholick Church, *ſeparating thoſe*
" *Queſtions which the Church has decided, from*
" *thoſe which do not belong to Faith.* p. 1.

It is evident, the meaning of *Monſieur de Meaux* in that paſſage muſt have been this; That *whatſoever was either not at all* contained in his Expoſition, or was *otherwiſe maintain'd* by any particular Authors, beyond the Expoſition he gives us of thoſe Points which are here mentioned, was not to be look'd upon by us, as any of *the Church*'s *Deciſion*, nor *neceſſary to be received by us as matter of Faith.*

I ſhall not need to ſay how many Doctrines and Deciſions, not only of private Writers, but of the very Council of *Trent* it ſelf, this would have at once cut off. It would perhaps have been one of the fair-

eſt Advances towards an Union, that ever the Church of *Rome* yet offered. But it ſeems whatever *Monſieur de Meaux* ſuppoſed, this was thought too great a condeſcenſion by others: and he was therefore obliged, without changing any thing in his Book, to give us a quite other account of the deſign of it.

Later Editions.

"So that it ſeems then we can do nothing better, than ſimply to propoſe to them (the Proteſtants) the ſentiments of the Catholick Church, and *diſtinguiſh them from thoſe Opinions that have been falſely imputed to her.* Which is but little to the Purpoſe.

II.

1 *Edit.* p. 7, 8. "The ſame Church teaches, That all Religious Worſhip ought to terminate upon God, as its neceſſary End. So that *the Honour* which the Church gives to the Bleſſed Virgin and to the Saints *is religious*, only becauſe it gives them that Honour with relation to God, and for the love of him.

"So that then, ſo far ought one to be from blaming the Honour which we give to the Saints, as our Adverſaries do, becauſe it is *Religious*, that on the contrary *it ought to be blamed if it were not Religious.*

There can be nothing more plain than that *Monſieur de Meaux*'s Opinion, when he wrote this, was, *That the Honour which the Church of* Rome *pays to the Bleſſed Virgin and Saints departed is a Religi-*

ous

ous Honour; nay would deſerve *to be blamed if it were not Religious.*

This was by others thought a little too ingenuous, and what would give too great an advantage to our objections againſt it. And therefore inſtead of that free and honeſt Confeſſion, *That the Church of* Rome *gives religious Honour to the Bleſſed Virgin and Saints departed*, he now puts a doubt that inſinuates the direct contrary,

"The ſame Church teaches us, that all religious Worſhip ought to terminate in God "as its neceſſary End; and *if the Honour* which "ſhe rendereth to the Bleſſed Virgin and to "the Saints, may *in ſome ſenſe be called* "*Religious*, it is for its neceſſary relation to "God.

So that really then *the Honour* they give their Saints in *Monſieur de Meaux*'s opinion *is Religious*, but 'tis not fit that we ſhould know it.

III.

Monſieur Daillé ſome years ſince wrote a Volume of *the Tradition of the Primitive Church, concerning the Object of Religious Worſhip*; in which he clearly ſhews that the firſt 300 years knew nothing of the *Invocation of Saints, the Worſhip of Images, Croſſes*, and *Reliques*; *of the Adoration of the Hoſt*, &c. *Monſieur de Meaux* in his firſt *Expoſition* granted the whole, in theſe words ſince ſtruck out,

"For *Monſieur Daillé*, ſays he, he thinks fit to "confine himſelf to the firſt three Centuries, in

" which *it is certain* that the Church more ex-
" erciſed in ſuffering than in writing, *has left*
" *many things to be cleared afterwards both in its*
" *Doctrine and in its Practice.* 1 Edit. p. 9.

Now it being evident, notwithſtanding this new thought, that *the ſufferings* of the firſt 300 years have not hindred, but that we have very large accounts of its Doctrine and Practice from the *Writings* of thoſe Fathers, who lived in them; To confeſs that *it is certain*, that the Tradition of the Church of *Rome* fails *in many things both in Doctrine and Practice* for the firſt 300 years, is doubtleſs as fair a yielding up the Cauſe, as to the matter of Tradition, as we could deſire; and therefore however known by *Monſieur de Meaux* to be *moſt certainly true*, was yet thought too much by others to be confeſſed to the World, by a perſon of ſo great Learning and Eminence in their Church.

IV.

As to the point of the *Invocation of Saints*, *Monſieur de Meaux* ſtill ſhews us that he knows not what account to give of the grounds of it. He propoſes ſeveral ways how the Saints may poſſibly know our Prayers, but cannot well tell us by which it is they do ſo.

But in the firſt Edition he ſhew'd yet more doubt: Not only *which way the Saints hear them*, but *whether they hear them at all or no*: Not only, *whether they joyn with them in their Prayers, as they deſire them to do*, but whether it is not rather *by ſome other means, yet more unknown to them*, and not by *their Interceſſion*, that they receive the benefit of them.

" The Church, ſays he, contents her ſelf to
" teach with all Antiquity, theſe prayers to
be

" be very profitable to ſuch who make them;
" *Whether it be* the Saints know them by the
" Miniſtry and Communication of Angels, who
" according to the Teſtimony of Scripture know
" what paſſes amongſt us; being eſtabliſhed by
" Gods order as adminiſtring Spirits to co-operate
" with us in the work of our ſalvation: *Whe-*
" *ther it be* that God makes known to them our
" deſires by a particular revelation: Or *whether*
" *it be* that he diſcovers the ſecret to them in
" his Divine Eſſence in which all truth is com-
" priz'd.

" And that in *the manner*, and *according to the*
" *meaſure* which he pleaſes; or *whether* laſtly
" by *ſome other way yet more inpenetrable and*
" *more unknown he cauſes us to receive the Fruit*
" *of thoſe Prayers which we addreſs to thoſe bleſſed*
" *Souls*. 1 Ed. p. 23.

VI

So that in effect, *whether the Saints hear us or no, whether they joyn with us in our requeſts or no*, according to *Monſieur de Meaux's Expoſition*, their Church knows not; which is ſure a ſufficient prejudice againſt their *Invocation*; and was, it ſeems, thought ſo by thoſe who therefore cauſed all the latter part of this paragraph to be ſtruck out, for fear of the advantage we might reaſonably make of it.

V.

But if *Monſieur de Meaux* in his firſt *Expoſition* freely confeſſ'd how uncertain *the grounds* of this *Invocation* were, he no leſs freely left it to our choice whether we would practiſe it or not. He aſſured us *there was no manner of obligation at all upon us ſo to do*:

do: And that the Church *would not condemn us if we did it not*, provided we *refuſed it not out of contempt*, or *with a Spirit of diſſenſion and Revolt*.

"Furthermore, ſays he, there is nothing ſo "unjuſt as to accuſe the Church of placing all "her piety in theſe devotions to the Saints; ſince "on the contrary ſhe lays *no obligation at all* "*on particular perſons to joyn in this Practice*.

"By which it appears clearly that *the Church* "*condemns only thoſe who refuſe it out of con-* "*tempt, and by a Spirit of diſſenſion and revolt*. 1 Ed. p. 33. 34.

This was *Monſieur de Meaux*'s firſt *Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church* in this point: But ſuch as his *Correctors* it ſeems would not admit of: Who therefore obliged him wholly to ſtrike out that paſſage,

"That the Church impoſes no obligation at "all upon particular perſons to practiſe this "Invocation:

And inſtead of condemning only thoſe that refuſe it out of *contempt*, or a *Spirit of diſſenſion and revolt*, which had freed us wholly from their *Anathema*, to expound it now more ſeverely,

"That ſhe condemns thoſe who refuſe this "practice whether *out of diſreſpect* or *Error*.

Which will be ſure to bring us under it.

VI.

VI.

In the Article of Images *Monſieur de Meaux* having firſt laid down this foundation,

"That the Church of *Rome* does not attribute
"to them *any other virtue* than that of exciting
"in us the remembrance of thoſe whom they
"repreſent;

added in his firſt Expoſition which was ſuppreſſed,

"'Tis in this conſiſts *the uſe* and *advantage* of
"Images. 1 Edit. p. 25.

And to aſſure us yet further how little Honour they had for them, concluded thus,

"So that to ſpeak properly, and according to
"the Eccleſiaſtical ſtyle, we *do not ſo much*
"*honour the Image* of an Apoſtle or Martyr,
"as we do *honour the Apoſtle or Martyr* in pre-
"ſence of the Image. 1 Edit. p. 28.

Now though we do not doubt but that this is the real opinion of *Monſieur de Meaux*, and all which he himſelf does, yet to ſay that the *Church of Rome* does neither *require*, nor *practiſe*, nor *intend* any more, was to preſume too much upon our Ignorance; and indeed to give too great a ſcandal to many of his own Communion, more zealous than himſelf for this ſervice: And therefore we find it now *expounded* in a manner more conformable to the truth, though ſtill exceedingly mollified,

"'Tis

"'Tis upon this is founded *the Honour* which "we give to Images: and again;

"When we honour the Image of an Apoſtle "or Martyr, our Intention is not ſo much to "honour the Image, as the Apoſtle or Mar-"tyr in preſence of the Image.

VII.

In the Section of Juſtification *Monſieur de Meaux* has omitted this whole paragraph ſince his firſt Edition:

"The Catholick Church, ſays he, is no where "more invincible than in this point, and per-"haps it would need no long diſcourſe to ſhew, "that the more one ſearches by the Scriptures "into the deſign of the Redemption of Man-"kind, which was to make us Holy, the more "one ſhall approach to our Doctrine, and the "more depart from the opinions of *Calvin*, "which are not maintainable, nay are contra-"dictory and ruinous of all true and ſolid piety. "1. Ed. p. 36, 37.

Monſieur de Meaux may pleaſe ſome other time to *expound* to us, what thoſe Opinions of *Calvin* in this matter are which the Church of *Rome* is ſo invincible in, and which all parties among them will agree to be ſo contradictory, and ruinous to all true and ſolid piety, as he then ſaid.

In

In the mean time we will only beg leave to obſerve on occaſion of this Correction, that perhaps there are ſome in the Church of *Rome* of Mr. *Calvin*'s mind in the worſt of thoſe Principles Monſieur *de Meaux* refers to, and to aſſure him that there are ſeveral Proteſtants in the World that are not; though they dare not therefore ſeverely cenſure the Opinions of thoſe that are.

VIII.

Monſieur *de Meaux* having in a very few words explained the Doctrine of Juſtification, upon which the Council of *Trent* is ſo long and perplex'd, aſſured us in his firſt *Expoſition*, That *that was enough for any Man to know to make him a thorough Chriſtian*.

> "Thus have you ſeen what is moſt neceſſary in "the Doctrine of *Juſtification*; and our Adver- "ſaries would be extraordinarily contentious "not to confeſs, *that there is no need to know any* "*more, to be a ſolid Chriſtian*, 1 Ed. P. 47.

This would have been of great advantage to us, and have freed us from the *Anathema*'s of many other Particulars, of which we more doubt, than of any thing Monſieur *de Meaux* has expounded of it; but this others thought too great a Conceſſion; and the Biſhop therefore, without changing any thing in his *Premiſes*, was forced to draw a very different *Concluſion* from them.

> "Thus have you ſeen what is moſt neceſſary in "the Doctrine of Juſtification, and our Adver-

"ſaries would be very unreaſonable if they "ſhould not confeſs, *that this Doctrine ſuffices to* "*teach Chriſtians, that they ought to refer all the* "*Glory of their Salvation to God through Jeſus* "*Chriſt.*

IX.

In the Article of Satisfaction, Monſieur *de Meaux* ſpeaking of the Temporal and Eternal Puniſhment of Sin, and how the one may be retain'd when the other is forgiven, had this Paragraph in the firſt Edition, ſince ſtruck out.

"The Church has alway acknowledged theſe "two different manners of applying the Re- "miſſion of Sins, which we have propoſed; "becauſe ſhe ſaw that in the Scriptures, beſides "the *firſt Pardon*, and which ought to be the "only, if Men were not ungrateful, and which "is pronounced in the terms of a *pure Remiſſion*, "there is *another Abſolution*, and *another Grace*, "that is propoſed in form of *a Judgement*, "where the Church ought not only to *looſe and* "*remit*, but alſo to *binde and retain*. 1. Edit. "p. 54, 55.

The *Cenſure* paſs'd upon this, were enough to make one ſuſpect, that either Monſieur *de Meaux*, or his *Correctors*, were ſenſible upon further Conſideration, that they could not ſo eaſily find out theſe *two forms, ſo diſtinguiſh'd in Holy Scripture*, or prove *that the Church had always acknowledged them*; and therefore judged it ſafer not to undertake it.

X.

X.

In the Article of *Confirmation*, ſpeaking of the *Impoſition of Hands*, Monſieur *de Meaux* inſinuated in his *firſt expoſition*, that it had *always been accompanied with the uſe of Chriſm ever ſince the Apoſtles.*

"Thus, ſays he, all Chriſtian Churches ſince the "Apoſtles times have religiouſly retained this "Practice, accompanying it (the Impoſition of "Hands) with holy Chriſm. 1. *Ed. p.* 65.

This was too clearly falſe to be ſuffer'd to paſs, and therefore it is now more looſe, ſo as to admit of an *Equivocation*, and yet ſeem to ſay ſtill the ſame thing.

"Thus all Chriſtian Churches ſince the Apo-"ſtles times have religiouſly retained it, making "uſe alſo of holy Chriſm.

XI.

In the Article of the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, Monſieur *de Meaux* having expounded it according to our Principles, in his firſt Edition, concluded with us too.

"So that it (the Maſs) may, ſays he, be very "*reaſonably called a Sacrifice*: 1 Ed. p. 115.

But ſince the Correction, the Concluſion is much ſtrengthned, though the Premiſes remain the ſame:

"So that there is *nothing wanting to it, to make* "*it a true Sacrifice.*

XII.

As to the point of the Pope's Authority, the firſt Expoſition ran much higher than it ſeems the Spirit of the Gallicane Church could bear.

> "So that our Profeſſion of Faith obliges us as "to this point, to believe the Roman Church "to be the *Mother* and *Miſtreſs* of all Churches, "and to render a *true Obedience* to the Pope, the "Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, and Vicar of Jeſus "Chriſt. 1 *Ed. p.* 166.

It is now more looſe, and in general thus;

> "We acknowledg a Primacy in the Succeſſors of "the Prince of the Apoſtles, to whom, for that "cauſe we owe that Obedience and Submiſſion "which the holy Councils and Fathers have al-"ways taught the Faithful.

But it may be what was ſtruck out of the *Expoſition* to pleaſe the *Correctors*, Monſieur *de Meaux* recompenſed in his *Letter* to ſatisfy his *Holineſs*.

XIII.

In the Concluſion Monſieur *de Meaux* telling us that none of thoſe Articles he had expounded, according to our own Principles, deſtroyed the Foundation of our Salvation, added in his firſt Expoſition what that Foundation was, *viz.*

"The

"The Adoration of one only God, Father, Son,
"and Holy Ghoſt, and the Truſt in one only
"Saviour. 1 *Ed. p.* 160.

It is hard to ſay why this was not let paſs, for we are unwilling to believe that the *Church of* Rome *has any other Foundation* for Salvation than this. But it may be to have put down this as the Foundation of Salvation, would have been too plainly to ſhew, that then we certainly have this, and that *without mixture of any thing deſtructive thereunto.*

XIV.

Monſieur *de Meaux* go's on in a very candid manner, ſince ſtruck out;

"In effect, ſays he, in all theſe Explications,
"which contain the very bottom of our Belief,
"there is not any one word repugnant to theſe
"two Principles, either directly, or by Conſe-
"quence.

"So that acknowledging then this, That
"the Church of *Rome* do's *believe*, and *profeſs*
"all that is *eſſential* to preſerve *the ſubſtance*
"*of the Chriſtian Religion*, ſo that they cannot
"reaſonably impute to us any Doctrine contra-
"ry thereunto, they muſt at the ſame time ac-
"knowledge, by their own Principles, that *the*
"*Church of* Rome *is a true part of the Church of*
"*Chriſt*, to which every Chriſtian is obliged to
"unite himſelf in his Heart, and in effect as far
"as in him lies. 1 *Ed.*

Monſieur

Monſieur *de Meaux* may pleaſe to know, that we do confeſs the Church of *Rome* to be *a part* of the *true Church*, though indeed we think *one of the worſt*; and that we do with all our Hearts deſire a Union with her; and in effect do ſhew it as far as we are able, by retaining whatever we can of the ſame Doctrines and Practices with her.

And if this were all they deſired of us, as indeed it is all they ought, and all we can do: However an abſolute Union would not thereby be obtained, yet might we live at leaſt like Chriſtians and Brethren, in a common Charity with one another, and ſo diſpoſe our Minds, as by God's Grace to come in a little time to ſome better agreement in the reſt too, than ever we are like to do without it.

Theſe are ſome of thoſe Paſſages that gave occaſion to the *correction* we have ſpoken of at *the Sorbon*, and to the *ſuppreſſion of the whole firſt Edition*, however *authorized by the Biſhops of France* in the ſame words it now is. I might have added many more; but inſtead of it, will beg leave to offer the Reader one *Correction* made very lately by *another Faculty*, that of *Louvain*; if not immediately of Monſieur *de Meaux*'s *Expoſition*, yet at leaſt of a Doctrine which they were before-hand given to underſtand, was ſo explained in it.

Monſieur *de Witte*, Paſtor and Dean of St. *Maries*, in the City of *Mechlin*, having, in a Diſcourſe with ſome Perſons of that City, on the *8th* of *July* laſt, maintained *the Authority of the Church and Pope*, according to the manner of Monſieur *de Meaux*'s *Expoſition*; complaint was made of him, firſt to the *Inter-nonce*, then to his *Holineſs* himſelf, and four Propo-

Propoſitions drawn up againſt him, as the Heads of his Hereſy.

Monſieur *de Witte* maintain'd his Opinion in ſeveral Papers printed to that end; in the * *4th* of which, after ſeveral other Authorities of Perſons of their Church defending the ſame Doctrine; He tells them,

[* *Intituled, Proſecutio probationis locum Mat. 16. non recte refundi in Apoſtolorum principis ſucceſſores.*]

"That the Golden Expoſition of Faith of "Monſieur the Biſhop of *Condom*, required no- "thing more to the ſound, Catholick, and Or- "thodox Faith in this Matter; which Expoſi- "tion, beſides the Elogies of many other Emi- "nent Perſons, was alſo approved by our Holy "Father *Innocent* the *11th* himſelf, in his kind "Letter to him.

Nihil prætereà, ad ſanam, Catholicam, & Orthodoxam fidem depoſcit aurea illa Expoſitio Catholicæ fidei Jacobi Epiſcopi Condomenſis, præter Illuſtriſſima Clariſſimorum Virorum Elogia, ipſius S. Patris Innocent. xi. peramantiſſimis literis comprobata.

But all this could not prevail with them to reſpect his Doctrine ever the more for Monſieur *de Meaux*'s *Expoſition*, or his *Holineſſes Brief*. The Faculty of Divinity, at the command of the *Nonce*, and with the knowledge, no doubt, and aſſent of the Pope, to whom the whole Affair had been communicated, *cenſured his Propoſitions*, Nov. 3. 1685. and eſpecially the ſecond, in which Monſieur *de Meaux*'s *Expoſition of the Catholick Faith* was principally concerned, as *ſcandalous* and *pernicious*.

"*Judicamus eam cenſurari poſſe uti ſcandaloſam* "*& pernicioſam.*

May thoſe who inſiſt ſo much on the *Fidelity* and *Authority* of Monſieur *de Meaux*'s *Expoſition*, pleaſe calmly to conſider theſe things; and tell us how we can

can rely on ſuch an *Expoſition of their Doctrine*, as notwithſtanding ſo many formal *Approbations*; firſt, of the Biſhops of *France*, was yet corrected in ſo many places by the *Sorbon*; and ſecondly, of the *Pope*, *Cardinals*, and *others in Italy*, and of the whole Body of *the Clergy of France* in their Aſſembly; has yet ſo lately been cenſured, at the command of the *Nonce*, and with the conſent of his Holineſs, by the Faculty of one of their moſt eminent Univerſities, to be *ſcandalous and pernicious*.

A Table

A

TABLE

OF THE

ARTICLES

Contained in this TREATISE.

Page.

I. THE *Introduction.* 3
II. *That Religious Worſhip is to be paid to God only.* 6
III. *Of the Invocation of Saints.* 9
IV. *Of Images and Relicks.* 13
V. *Of Juſtification.* 19
VI. *Of Merits.* 21
VII. *Of Satisfactions, Indulgences, and Purgatory.* 24

Sect. 1. *Of Satisfactions.* ibid.
Sect. 2. *Of Indulgences.* 27
Sect. 3. *Of Purgatory.* 30

PART II.

VIII. *Of the Sacraments in general.* 33
IX. *Of Baptiſm.* 35
X. *Of Confirmation.* 39
XI. *Of Penance and Confeſſion.* 40
XII. *Of Extream Unction.* 44
XIII. *Of Marriage.* 45

A TABLE.

XIV. *Of Holy Orders.* 46
XV. *Of the Euchariſt; and firſt of the Explication of thoſe words,* This is my Body. 47
XVI. *Do this in remembrance of Me.* 54
XVII. *The Doctrine of the Church of* England *concerning this holy Sacrament.* 55
XVIII. *Of Tranſubſtantiation, and of the Adoration of the Hoſt.* 58
XIX. *Of the Sacrifice of the Maſs.* 62
XX. *Of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.* 67
XXI. *Reflections upon the foregoing Doctrine.* 69
XXII. *Of Communicating under one kind.* 72

PART III.

XXIII. *Of the Word written and unwritten.* 75
XXIV. *Of the Authority of the Church.* 76
XXV. *The Opinion of the Church of* England, *as to the Authority of the Church.* 80
XXVI. *The Authority of the holy See, and of Epiſcopacy.* 81
XXVII. *The Cloſe.* 82

A N

AN

EXPOSITION

OF THE

Doctrine of the Church of *England*

In the ſeveral Articles expounded by

Monſieur *de* MEAUX.

I. *The Introduction.*

IT has always been eſteemed more reaſonable to doubt of *Principles* firſt, and then to deny the *Concluſions* that are drawn from them, than having granted the Foundation, afterwards to cavil at the clear and neceſſary Deductions from it.

To profeſs, "that *Religious Worſhip is due to God* "*only*; and at the ſame time to ſay that we ought to adore Men and Women, Croſſes and Images, and all that infinite variety of Follies which theſe latter Ages have ſet forth under the pious name of Relicks: To declare, "*That we are ſaved only by Chriſt's Merits*; and yet ſtill continue to teach us that we ought to ſet up our own: In a word, to ſay, "*That the Death* "*of Chriſt was a perfect Sacrifice, and one drop of his* "*Blood more than ſufficient for the Redemption of Man-*

"*kind*; and nevertheleſs go on to require our *Satisfactions* as neceſſary too, and oblige us to believe that other *Propitiatory Sacrifices* beſides *that* of the *Croſs*, ought to be offered up continually to God in his Church, *for the Sins both of the Dead and the Living*: This muſt certainly be the part of a Diſputant, either too ignorant to underſtand, or too obſtinate to ſubmit to any Conviction.

Monſieur *de Meaux*, the deſign of whoſe Expoſition ſeems rather to be an *Apology* for the Popiſh Religion, than a free *Aſſertion* and *Vindication* of its Errors, is above all things ſenſible of the juſtice of this Reflection: and therefore endeavours by all means poſſible in the very entry of his Treatiſe to prepare his Reader againſt it, By ſhewing "*the Injuſtice of* "*charging Conſequences upon Men which they do not al-*"*low*; and that therefore though their Superſtructure "ſhould chance to overthrow their Foundation, yet "ſince they profeſs not to know that it does ſo, they "ought not to be taxed with what they do not believe.

It is not deny'd but that Conſequences may be ſometimes either ſo obſcure, or ſo far diſtant, that a Perſon prejudicate for the Principle, may well be excuſed the charge of a Collection, which his Actions ſhew he neither believes nor approves. But when the Concluſions, as well as Principles, are plain and confeſs'd, and the Diſpute is only about the *Name*, not the *Thing*; we muſt beg leave to profeſs, that we cannot chuſe but ſay that he believes not as he ought *the infinite Merits of Chriſt's Sacrifice*, who requires *any other Offering for ſin*; and that no ſubtilty of Argument will ever perſwade us that thoſe deſtroy not their Principle of *worſhipping God only*, whom we ſee, contrary to his expreſs Command, *proſtrate* every day

day before an *Image*, with Prayers and Hymns to Creatures that have been ſubject to like Infirmities with our ſelves, and that are perhaps at this very time in a worſer Eſtate, than the moſt miſerable of thoſe that call upon them for their aſſiſtance.

Be it therefore allow'd to be as a great Calumny, as Monſieur *de Meaux* can ſuppoſe it, to accuſe Men of Conſequences obſcure and diſavow'd; the Opinions we charge the Church of *Rome* with, are plain and confeſs'd, the Practice and Preſcription of the chiefeſt Authority in it. And to refuſe our Charge of them, is in good earneſt nothing elſe than *to proteſt againſt a matter of Fact*; a Plea, which even Juſtice it ſelf has told us, may without Calumny be rejected as invalid.

However, thus much at leaſt we have got by this Reflection, that it directs us to the true State of the Controverſy between us; and ſhews, That we, who have been ſo often charged by the Church of *Rome* as *Innovators in Religion*, are at laſt by their own confeſſion, allow'd to hold the ancient and undoubted Foundation of the Chriſtian Faith; and that the Queſtion between us therefore is not, *Whether what we hold be true?* which is on all hands agreed; but, *Whether thoſe things which the Roman Church has added as Superſtructures to it, and which, as ſuch, we reject, be not ſo far from being neceſſary Articles of Religion, as they pretend, that they indeed overthrow that Truth which is on both ſides allow'd to be Divine; and upon that account ought to be forſaken by them?*

The Declaration of this, not ſo much by any new proof, as by clearing rather the true ſtate of thoſe Points which are the ſubject of our Difference, is the deſign of the following Articles; in which I ſhall endea-

endeavour to give a clear and free account of what we can approve, and what it is that we diſlike in their Doctrine; and as far as the ſhortneſs of this Diſcourſe will allow, touch alſo upon ſome of thoſe Reaſons that are the moſt uſually given by us for both.

ARTICLE II.

That Religious Worſhip is to be paid to God only.

That Religious Worſhip is due to God only, how neceſſary ſoever thoſe Practices of the Roman Church, which we are hereafter to conſider, may have rendred it to Monſieur *de Meaux* to declare, yet is it, we ſuppoſe, but little neceſſary for us to ſay,

We firmly believe, that "*the inward acknowledg-*
"*ment of his Divine Excellencies as the Creator and*
"*Lord of all things, is a part of the ſupream Worſhip*
"*that is due to him. We believe that all the Powers of*
"*our Soul ought to be tied to him by Faith, Hope, and*
"*Charity, as to that God who alone can eſtabliſh and*
"*make us happy.* And though we do not think that there is now *any ſenſible, or material Sacrifice* to be offered to Him under the Goſpel, as there was heretofore under the Law: yet do we with all Antiquity ſuppoſe the *Sacrifice of Prayer and Thanksgiving* to be ſo peculiarly his due, that it cannot, without derogation to his Honour, be applied to any other.

What our Opinion is of that Worſhip which the Roman Church pays to the *Bleſſed Virgin*, and *Saints departed*,

departed, we ſhall hereafter more fully ſhew: But certainly great was the difference of thoſe *Holy Men* whom Monſieur *de Meaux* mentions as their fore-runners in this practice, from the preſent manner of the *Popiſh Invocation*. *Gregory Nazianzen* in a Rhetorical Apoſtrophe, *called* to *Conſtantius* in one, to his Siſter *Gorgonia* in another Oration, but he *prayed* to neither. St. *Baſil*; St. *Ambroſe*; St. *J. Chryſoſtom*; St. *Hierom*; St. *Auguſtin*; they deſired ſometimes that the Martyr or Saint would joyn with them in their requeſts, but they were rather *Raptures* and *Wiſhes*, than direct *Prayers*; and their formal Petitions, but eſpecially thoſe of the Church, were only to God Almighty. They *doubted whether the Saints could hear them or no*; and were rather inclined to believe that they could not. The *Addreſſes of the Mind*, which the Church of *Rome* allows no leſs than the others to them, they look'd upon to be ſo peculiarly God's due, that they ſuppoſed they were not communicated to the very Angels that are in Heaven. They declared againſt all thoughts of being aſſiſted by the *Merits* of their Saints, or that God would ever the more readily, or indeed ſo ſoon accept their Prayers coming by the Interceſſion of another, as if they had gone themſelves directly to the Throne of Grace. In a word; they never imagined that this was *an Honour due to them*; but, on the contrary, conſtantly taught that it was a Service belonging *only to God Almighty*.

Well therefore might * Monſieur *Daillé* refer the beginnings of this *Invocation* to theſe Men, whoſe innocent Wiſhes, and Rhetorical Flights, being ſtill increaſed by the Superſtition of after-Ages, firſt gave birth to this Worſhip. But certainly the *Romaniſts* cannot with any reaſon alledge them in favour of their

* *And that it is the moſt he does; See* de Cult. *Lat. l.* 3. *c.* 18.

their Error, till it be ſhewn either that we are miſtaken in thoſe differences we have here declared to be between what they did, and what the Church of *Rome* now practiſes; or that they are otherwiſe proved to be ſo inconſiderable, as not to make any notable alteration in it. And yet that the Ages before knew nothing even of this, not only their confeſſed inability to produce any Proofs from them of this Superſtition, but the contrary Teſtimonies of the undoubted Writings of *Ignatius*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Novatian*, and others, ſo plainly ſhew, that it ought not to be eſteemed at all raſh at this diſtance to aſſert, that in this very ſmall Change, *the Fathers of the fourth Century, did certainly begin to depart from the Practice and Tradition of thoſe before them.* And if that Reaſon of the Church of *Rome* be of any ſtrength, why they pray'd not to the Holy Men under the Old Teſtament, viz. *becauſe they were not then admitted to the ſight of God, and therefore ought not to be prayed to*: It ſeems to us that not only the greater part of the Primitive Fathers, but even thoſe very Men Monſieur *de Meaux* mentions, could not certainly have allowed ſuch an Invocation as is now uſed in their Church; the moſt of them being notoriouſly known, and even by their own Writers freely confeſſed, to have believed the ſame, *That neither do the Saints and Confeſſors of the Chriſtian Church any more enjoy the Preſence of God even now.*

Thus much was thought fit to be ſaid to remove that Prejudice Monſieur *de Meaux* had thrown in the way. We go on now with him to conſider the Doctrine it ſelf, and what our Church's Opinion is of it.

ARTIC.

ARTICLE III.

Of the Invocation of Saints.

THE Invocation of Saints, *as it is ſtated by* Monſieur *de Meaux*, we look upon to be one of thoſe Practices which our Church ſtiles, "*fond things*, "*vainly invented, and grounded upon no Warrant of* "*Holy Scripture, but indeed repugnant to God's Word.* Monſieur *de Meaux* himſelf dares not ſay that they do or can ordinarily by *any ability in themſelves*, hear, ſee, or know, the Wants, State, or Prayers of Men upon Earth, to be mindful of them unto God in Heaven. Nor can it ever be proved that by *any of thoſe ways which he propoſes*, but ſeems himſelf not to lay any great ſtreſs upon, they are certainly and particularly communicated to them.

We think therefore, that till this be cleared, it is too great a hazard to leave a Mediator, who both certainly knows our wants, and has promiſed to hear us; that has invited us, nay commanded us to come to him in all our Needs, to go to Interceſſors which God has no where appointed, and which we can never be ſure our Prayers ſhall come up to. It ſufficeth not that they may know *ſome things*, *in ſome places*, *at ſome times*, and *of ſome Men extraordinarily*, unleſs we could tell *what Saints*, and *what things*, and *in what places*, and *at what times*, they do know them. When this is cleared, it may then be more reaſonable to deſire us to joyn with them in this Service. In the mean time, though we ſhould not charge

them with *Idolatry* meerly for this, yet we muſt needs confeſs we cannot but think theſe Addreſſes to be too full of hazard and uncertainty to venture any Requeſts at all, much leſs ſo many as they do every day, upon them.

In vain therefore does Monſieur *de Meaux* endeavour to defend the *Innocence* of this Invocation, whilſt he forgets to ſhew us the *Reaſonableneſs* of it. We ſhould be pleaſed indeed to be aſſured of that; but we cannot be convinced that we ought to joyn in the Practice till we are ſatisfied of the other too. And yet we cannot but regret, that if their deſign be truly no more than this, *to intreat the Saints to pray for them*, we ſhould find the greateſt part of their Service addreſſing to them after ſo contrary a manner; that they would interpoſe not only their *Interceſſions*, but their *Merits* too for their forgiveneſs: Not only that they would *pray to God for them, but that they would themſelves bleſs them.* "That the Angels and "Saints *would give them Strength, Grace, Health, and* "*Power.* That St. *Peter would have Mercy upon them,* "*and open to them the Gate of Heaven.* That the Bleſſed "Virgin *would protect them from their Enemies, and re-* "*ceive them at their Death:* In a word, *that ſhe would* "*command her Son to forgive them by that Right, which as* "*a Mother ſhe had over him.* All which their very publick Rituals ſo far allow, that the Service which is paid to God in his Church *by the Mediation of Chriſt*, is infinitely exceeded by the Addreſſes of this nature, through *the Merits of the Virgin* Mary, *and of the Saints.*

This Paſſage is often deny'd: See *Caſſander Conſult.* in Art. 21.

Now if theſe Prayers ſignify no more than, as Monſieur *de Meaux* expounds them, *to intreat the Saints to pray for them*, why have we ſuch Scandals given us in the Practice? If they intend really what

we

we ſuppoſe, and what their words do certainly ſignify; what Ingenuity can it be to impoſe upon us in the Declaration? However at leaſt they will pleaſe to excuſe us that we have fallen at ſo juſt a ſtumbling Block; and charged them as derogating from the Merits of Chriſt, whilſt they have thus cry'd up the Merits of their Saints, and of a Preſumption unwarrantable, if not wholly Idolatrous, in deſiring any but God alone *to help*, and *ſuccour*, and *give them thoſe Bleſſings*, which God only has power to diſpenſe.

1. When therefore we ſhall be certainly aſſured that all that infinite number which the Church of *Rome* has canonized, are truly and infallibly *Saints*.

2. When we ſhall be aſſured that theſe Saints do *already enjoy the Preſence of God Almighty*; a Circumſtance which the Papiſts themſelves confeſs neceſſary to warrant their Invocation.

3. When it ſhall be made undoubtedly appear, that either by their *own Knowledg*, or by ſome *other Revelation, they do ordinarily and particularly underſtand all the Requeſts that are made to them*; ſo that we can be as ſecure of their hearing us, as when we deſire our Brethren upon Earth to pray for us.

4. When the Liturgies of their Church ſhall be reformed, and all thoſe dangerous Inſinuations of the *Merit* and *Perſonal Aſſiſtance* of their Saints be removed.

5. When thoſe deſperate Doctrines, and yet more deſperate Addreſſes of their School-men and Controvertiſts, which ſcandalize the more moderate even of their own Party, ſhall be cenſured.

6. And Men taught to practiſe this Invocation with ſuch Sobriety, as neither to make it ſo freely and publickly their Worſhip as they do, nor with any Opinion of being either *ſooner heard*, or more *effectu-*

ally anſwered by this way of Addreſs, than by going directly to God by our Saviour and only Mediator Jeſus Chriſt.

7. In a word, when even an Invocation ſo moderated, ſhall be ſhewn either to have been commanded by God Almighty, or to have been adviſed by his Apoſtles, or to have been practiſed *ordinarily and directly* by the moſt Primitive Chriſtians: Or laſtly, but to be no way injurious to the excellent Goodneſs of that Interceſſor, who has ſo kindly invited, and even conjured us to come to him in all our needs; Then will we not fail to joyn our *Ora pro Nobis* with them: But till then we muſt beg leave to conclude with a Charity and Moderation, which we ſuppoſe they themſelves cannot but approve in us, *That it is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Holy Scripture, but rather indeed contrary thereunto.*

And what we have now ſaid of their Prayers, we muſt in the next place apply to their Sacrifices too. *To mention the Names of the Holy Saints departed in the Communion*; this we look upon to be a Practice as innocent as 'tis ancient. So far are we from condemning it in them, that we practiſe it our ſelves. *We name them at our Altars, we give God thanks for their Excellencies, and pray to him for Grace to follow their Examples.* But as we allow thus much to their Memories, ſo we cannot but condemn that Practice which Monſieur *de Meaux* ſeems to have omitted, tho' yet the chief thing that offends us; that they recommend the Offerings which they make to God, through *the Merits* of their Saints which they commemorate, and deſire that by their Merits they may become available to the Churches needs. As if *Chriſt himſelf*, whom they ſuppoſe to be the *Sacrifice*, needed the

Aſſiſtance

Assistance of St. *Bathildis* or *Potentiana*, to recommend him to his Father: Or, that the *Merits* of an Offering, which they tell us is the very same with that of the Cross, should desire the joynt *Deserts* of a St. *Martin* to obtain our Forgiveness.

They who shall consider these things as they ought, will, we doubt not, confess that we have some reason to complain, both that they derogate herein from Christ's Merits, and attribute to their Saints more than they ought to do. If this Practice be reformed, our Complaint, as to this point, ceaseth. If it be not, in vain does Monsieur *de Meaux* endeavour to perswade us, that they *only name their Saints to give God thanks for their Excellencies*, whilst their publick Practice avows, that they desire both the pardon of their Sins, and even the acceptance of their very Sacrifices themselves, by their Mediation.

ARTICLE IV.

Of Images and Relicks.

WHat the Opinion of the Church of *England* is concerning the Worship of Images and Relicks, will need no long Declaration to shew, they being joyn'd by her in the same Article with that of the Invocation of Saints before-mentioned, and by consequence, submitted by her to the same Censure. Artic. XXII.

But then, as we before complained, that both the Practice of their Church in the publick Liturgies of it, and the approved Doctrine of their most reputed Writers, should so far contradict what Monsieur *de Meaux*

Meaux would have us think is their only deſign in that Service; ſo we cannot but repeat the ſame Complaints in this: That if all the uſe their Church would have made of Images and Relicks, be *only to excite the more lively in their Minds the remembrance of the Originals*, not only the People ſhould be ſuffered to fall into ſuch groſs Miſtakes, as 'tis undeniably evident they do, in their Worſhip of them; but even their Teachers be permitted without any Reproof to confirm them in their Errors.

Has St. *Thomas* and his Followers, nay, and even their *Pontifical* it ſelf, ever yet been cenſured by them, for maintaining *in plain terms*, that *the Image of the Croſs ought to be worſhipped with the ſame Worſhip as that Saviour who ſuffered on it?* Have the Jeſuits been condemned for teaching Men *to ſwear by it*? Does not their whole Church upon *Good-friday* yet addreſs her ſelf to it in theſe very dangerous words, *Behold the Wood of the Croſs! Come let us adore it.* And do not their Actions agree with their Expreſſions, and the whole Solemnity of that day's Service plainly ſhew, that they do *adore IT* in the utmoſt propriety of the Phraſe? Does ſhe not pray to it, that *in this time of the Paſſion, it would ſtrengthen the Righteous, and give Pardon to the Guilty?* Is the Hymn for the day of the *Invention* corrected, wherein they profeſs that *the Croſs heals their Sickneſſes, ties up the Devil, and gives them Newneſs of Life*; and thereupon deſire it *to ſave its Aſſembly, gathered together in its honour*? Is the manner of conſecrating them changed, in which they intreat God to bleſs the Image of the Croſs which they there ſanctify, that it may be for *the eſtabliſhment of their Faith, an increaſe of their good Works, the Redemption of their Souls, and their Protection*

tection againſt the cruel Darts of the Enemy? That Chriſt would embrace this Croſs, over which they pray, *as he did that* upon which he ſuffer'd: *That as by THAT he delivered the whole World from its Guilt; ſo by the Merits of THIS, they who dedicate it may receive remiſſion of their Sins.* In a word, that *as many as bow down before it, may find health both of their Souls and Bodies by it.*

And is all this in good earneſt no more than *to excite more lively in our minds the remembrance of Him that loved us, and delivered himſelf to the Death for us*, and to teſtifie by ſome outward marks our acknowledgment of that favour, by humbling our ſelves in preſence of the Croſs, to declare thereby our ſubmiſſion to Him that was crucified.

Is not this rather, if not abſolutely to fall into, yet certainly too nearly to approach to that which Monſieur *de Meaux* himſelf confeſſes to be Idolatry, viz. *to truſt in the Images as if there were ſome divinity or virtue joyned to them*, and for which they not only ſhew all imaginable marks of outward Worſhip, by Kiſſings, Proſtrations, and the like Ceremonies; but make as formal Addreſſes to them, and that in the publick Service of the Church, as to God himſelf?

How this allow'd practice can be reconciled with the prohibition of the Council of *Trent*, "*Not to believe any Divinity or Virtue tied to their Images of which they ought to be adored; nor to demand any Grace of them, nor place any Truſt or Confidence in them*; Monſieur *de Meaux* may pleaſe to *expound* to us. In the mean time, as we are ſo far from condemning the making of all ſorts of Images, that we think it not any Crime to have the Hiſtories of the Goſpel carved or painted in our very Churches, which the Walls

Walls and Windows of ſeveral of them do declare: As we publickly uſe *the ſign of the Croſs* in one of our very Sacraments, and cenſure no Man for practiſing it, only without Superſtition, on any other occaſion: ſo we cannot but avow the Scandal that is given us by thoſe Doctrines and Practices before mentioned; and that we think that Worſhip juſtly to be aboliſhed which the Primitive Church abhorred, and which at this day ſcandalizes not only ſo great a number of *Chriſtians*, but even our common Enemy the *Jew* and *Turk*: In a word, which is ſo far from being commanded by God, that it needs many nice Diſtinctions to render it not directly oppoſite to an expreſs Prohibition; and is therefore if not down-right Idolatry to thoſe who know how *to direct their Intention aright*, yet to the Simple and Ignorant, that is, to the much greater number, and the moſt zealous practitioners of this Service, ſo very near it, *that the Generality of the wiſeſt Papiſts, no leſs than We, complain of it.*

FOR the honour that is due to RELIQUES, no *Proteſtant* will ever refuſe what ever *the Primitive Church paid them*; *or may be fit to expreſs the Honour we ought to retain for thoſe Bodies that by Martyrdom have been made Sacrifices to God Almighty.* If this be all Mr. *de Meaux* deſires of us, we are ready to profeſs our Opinion, that we judg it to be neither offenſive to God, nor fit to be ſcrupled by any good Man.

We believe that according to the Circumſtances of the Times, the Church may "teſtify this Honour by "more or leſs outward Signs and Marks of Reſpect. "And we do with ſatisfaction read that Declaration "of Mr. *de Meaux*, That we ought not to be ſervilely "ſubjected to theſe outward Ceremonies, but to be "invited by them to offer up to God that reaſonable "ſervice

"ſervice, in Spirit and in Truth, which he requires of us. And if this be the State of the Queſtion, we confeſs the Explication of it has taken away a great part of the difficulty.

But what then means the Council of *Trent*, to tell us, That we are not only to honour them, but to *Worſhip them* too? That by doing ſo, we ſhall obtain many *Benefits* and *Graces of God.* That theſe ſacred Monuments *are not unprofitably revered, but are to be ſought unto for the obtaining their help and aſſiſtance; to cure the Sick, to give Eyes to the Blind, Feet to the Lame, and even life to the Dead.* How comes it to paſs that their Church not only honours them, which we could allow, but carries them in PROCESSIONS, makes OFFERINGS to them, gives INDULGENCES to ſuch as ſhall go to viſit them; preſcribes PILGRIMAGES to them, SWEARS by them, touches their Beads, or Hankerchiefs, with them to SANCTIFY them; thinks to obtain one BLESSING by virtue of this RELICK, another from that; and the like ſuperſtitious uſages, which we ſuppoſe we have good reaſon with our Church, to conclude to be "*fond things, vainly invented, and grounded up-*
"*on no Authority of Holy Scripture, but indeed repugnant* Art. xxi.
"*thereunto.*

When therefore all theſe Abuſes which we have named, and which Monſieur *de Meaux* ſeems content to allow with us to be ſuch, ſhall be corrected: When in the matter of *Images*,

1. The Hymns and Addreſſes that teach us, ſo contrary to the Spirit of Chriſtianity, to demand Graces of them, and to put our Truſt in them, ſhall be reformed; St. *Thomas* and his Abettors cenſured; and all other Marks of an unwarrantable Worſhip be forbidden.

2. When *the Pictures of God the Father, and of the Holy Trinity*, ſo directly contrary both to the ſecond Commandment, and to St. *Paul's* Doctrine, ſhall be taken away, and thoſe of our Saviour, and the bleſſed Saints be by all neceſſary Cautions rendred truly *the Books* not

Snares of the Ignorant. When in points of *Relicks*,

3. They ſhall be declared to have no *ſanctifying Virtue* in them:

4. Nor that they ought to be ſought to for any Aſſiſtance Spiritual or Temporal to be expected from them.

5. When it ſhall be reſolved to be no matter of *Merit to go to viſit them*:

6. Nor any more extravagant *Indulgences* be ſet forth for *Pilgrimages* unto them.

When all theſe things which Monſieur *de Meaux* paſſes over, and which yet are undeniably their Practice and our Scandal, ſhall be corrected; Then will we both believe and ſubmit to the reſt which he deſires of us: we will *honour the Relicks of the Saints as the Primitive Church did*: we will reſpect the Images of our Saviour, and the Bleſſed Virgin: And as ſome of us now bow towards the Altar, and all of us are enjoyned to do ſo at the Name of the Lord Jeſus; ſo will we not fail to teſtify all due Reſpect to his Repreſentation. In the mean time, if the Outcries of their own Church at theſe Abuſes cannot prevail with them to redreſs them, yet at leaſt they will confirm us in the Reformation we have made of them; and whilſt we find *Hezekiah* commended in the Holy Scripture for deſtroying the Brazen Serpent, though made by God's expreſs Command, and in ſome ſort deſervedly honourable for that great Deliverance it brought to the Jews, *Becauſe the Children of Iſrael offered Incenſe unto it*: We ſhall conclude our ſelves to be by ſo much the more juſtifiable, in that the Images we have removed were due only *to the Folly and Superſtition of Men*, and have been more ſcandalouſly abuſed, *to a worſer and greater diſhonour of God*.

2 King. 18.

ARTIC.

ARTIC. V.

Of Juſtification.

THE Doctrine of *Juſtification* is one of thoſe Points that deſerves our careful Conſideration; as being not only one of the chiefeſt of thoſe Points wherein we ſuppoſe the Church of *Rome* to have prevaricated the Faith, but as Monſieur *de Meaux* remarks, *one of the firſt that gave occaſion to that Reformation* that was made from it.

It is not neceſſary to ſay to what an Extravagance the buſineſs of *Pardons*, *Indulgences*, and other means of *ſatisfying* the Divine Juſtice, was arrived; and how much more confidence the People generally put in the Inventions of Men, than in the Merits and Satisfaction of Chriſt. If they have been ſomewhat better inſtructed ſince, they may thank the Reformation for it: tho' we fear all the difference is, that they are ſomewhat more reſerved in expoſing theſe Follies now, but yet ſtill retain the Foundation of that Doctrine upon which they are built.

We willingly allow Monſieur *de Meaux* this honour, that he has reduced the long Decrees of the Council of *Trent* to a ſhort and eaſie Debate; and propoſed the things which contain our Difference with ſuch tenderneſs, as might invite us to cloſe with a great part of it, did not the Decrees of the Council ſeem too plainly to refuſe Monſieur *de Meaux*'s Expoſition of them.

We believe with him, "That our Sins are freely for-"given by God's Mercy through Chriſt; and that none "of thoſe things which precede our Juſtification, whether "our Faith, or our good Works, could merit this Grace. "We are perſwaded that our Sins are not only covered, "but are entirely done away by the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.

"We confeſs that the Righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt is "not only imputed, but actually communicated to the "Faithful, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, in

" ſo much that they are not only reputed, but made juſt " by his Grace.

" We deny not that this Righteouſneſs is a true Righ- " teouſneſs, even in the ſight of God; becauſe that it is " God who by Charity works it in us: only we think it withal ſuch as is too weak to obtain for us the pardon of our Sins, which Monſieur *de Meaux* ſeems content to confeſs with us.

" We willingly acknowledge that our Righteouſneſs is " not perfect in this Life. Whilſt we are in the Body, " the *Fleſh will luſt againſt the Spirit*, and *in many things* " *we ſhall offend all.* The life of a Chriſtian is a continued ſtate of Repentance: and he muſt be too much opiniated of himſelf that refuſes to conclude with St. *Auguſtine*; " *That our Righteouſneſs in this Life, conſiſteth ra-* " *ther in the Remiſſion of our Sins, than in the Perfection of* " *our Vertue.*

In a word; the ſum of our Difference as to this Point, ſeems to be this. Our Church by *Juſtification*, underſtands only *the Remiſſion of our Sins*: We diſtinguiſh it from *Sanctification*, which conſiſts in the *production of the Habit of Righteouſneſs in us.* We believe our ſins are pardoned only through the *Merits* of Chriſt *imputed* to us. And for the reſt, we ſay, that this *Remiſſion of Sins* is given only to thoſe that repent; that is, in whom the Holy Spirit produces the Grace of *Sanctification*, for a true Righteouſneſs and Holineſs of Life.

The Church of *Rome* comprehends under the notion of *Juſtification*, not only *the Remiſſion of Sins*, but alſo *the production of that inherent Righteouſneſs*, which we call *Sanctification.* They ſuppoſe with us, that our Sins are forgiven only by the Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt. But then as they make that *inward Righteouſneſs* a part of *Juſtification* too; ſo by conſequence, they ſay our *Juſtification* it ſelf is wrought alſo by *our own good Works.*

It appears by this, that were theſe things clearly ſtated, and diſtinguiſh'd the one from the other, the difference between us, conſidered only in the *Idea*, would not be very great: And that we might ſafely allow whatſoever Monſieur *de Meaux* has advanced upon this point, provided it be but well and rightly explained; though in ſome things he has expreſſed himſelf after a manner unuſual among us; and which we ſuppoſe not ſo entirely conformable to the Expreſſions of Holy Scripture.

The ſum of all is this. Chriſt died, and by that Death *ſatisfied* the Juſtice of God for us. God therefore through the *Merits* of his Son, freely forgives us all our Sins, and offers us a Covenant, of Mercy and Grace. By this Covenant, founded only upon the *Death* and *Merits* of Chriſt, he ſends us his Holy Spirit, and calls us powerfully to Repentance. If we awake and anſwer this Call, then God by his free Goodneſs juſtifies us; that is, he pardons our Sins paſt, gives us Grace more and more to fulfil his Commands for the time to come; and if we perſevere in this Covenant crowns us finally with Eternal Life. And all this he is pleaſed to do, not for any thing which we have, or can perform, but only through the *Merits* and *Satisfaction* of his Son by Faith applied to us.

This is the Foundation wherein Monſieur *de Meaux* ſeems content to agree with us. We go on to ſee how the following Doctrine will ſtand upon this Foundation.

ARTIC. VI.

Of Merits.

FOR what concerns the *Merits of Good Works*, we are content to accept of Monſieur de *Meaux's* Expoſition; "That *Eternal Life* ought to be propoſed to Men as "the Grace of God mercifully beſtow'd upon us through "Jeſus Chriſt, and as a recompence that is faithfully ren-

"dred

"dred to their good Works, and to the merits of them *by* "*vertue of God's Promiſe.*

The word *Merit* we acknowledge to have been very antient in the Church; and tho' to prevent thoſe miſtakes which many in theſe latter ages have made on occaſion of that expreſſion, we think it ſafer to diſcourſe more reſervedly of the *Merit*, and preſs more ſtrongly the *Neceſſity* of good Works: Yet if it be underſtood ſo as Monſieur *de Meaux* expounds it, That all our *Merit* derives its force only from the *Merits* of Jeſus Chriſt, who works in us both *to will and to do*; and when we have done, renders by the ſame *Merits* our good Works acceptable to God, and available to our *Eternal Life*, we ſhall not be difficult to allow of it.

If this be All the Church of *Rome* aſcribes to Good works, that our Juſtification proceeds *abſolutely* from God's Bounty and Mercy, and but *accidentally* only (in as much as God has tied himſelf by his Word and Promiſe to reward them) from our own Performances; We need no long exhortations to receive a Doctrine which we have always defended againſt ſuch of the Church of *Rome* as have oppoſed it, and are not yet, that we know of, cenſured, for their ſo doing.

That which we reject is, "That we do as *truly* "and *properly merit Rewards* when we do well, as we "do *merit Puniſhment* when we do ill: ſo ſays the Jeſuit *Maldonate*. "That our Good Works do me- "rit Eternal Life *condignly, not only by reaſon of God's* "*Covenant and Acceptation, but alſo by reaſon of the* *Work it ſelf*; ſo ſays Cardinal *Bellarmine*. All which *Vaſquez* ſums up in the three following Concluſions; "1. That the Good Works of juſt Perſons are *of them-* "*ſelves, without any Covenant or Acceptation, worthy* "*of the reward of Eternal Life*, and have an equal "value *of Condignity* to the obtaining of Eternal "Glory. 2. That there comes *no acceſſion of Dignity* to "the

Ezek. 18. 20.

De Juſtif. l. 5. c. 17. *Vaſquez in* D. Th. 1. 2. q. 114. d. 214. c. 5.

Ib. c. 7.

"the Works of juſt Perſons *by the Merits or Perſon of* "*Chriſt*, which the ſame would not otherwiſe have, if they "had been done by the ſame Grace beſtowed freely by "God alone without Chriſt. 3. That God's Promiſe is Ib. c. 8. "indeed annex'd to the Works of juſt Men, but yet be- "longs no way to the *Merit* of them, but cometh rather "to the *Works* themſelves, which are already not only *wor-* "*thy*, but *meritorious* alſo. From all which he draws this remarkable Corollary; Seeing, "THE WORKS OF JUST Diſp. 222. c 3. "MEN DO MERIT ETERNAL LIFE, AS AN E- n. 30, 31. "QUAL RECOMPENCE AND REWARD, *there is no* "*need that any other condign Merit, ſuch as that of* "*Chriſt, ſhould interpoſe, to the end that Eternal Life* "*might be rendred to them.* ------ Wherefore we never "pray to God that by the Merits of Chriſt, the Reward "of Eternal Life may be given to our worthy and merito- "rious Works; but that Chriſt's Grace may be given to "us, whereby *we may be enabled* WORTHILY TO ME- "RIT THIS REWARD.

This is that Doctrine of good Works which we moſt juſtly do deteſt: And if the Opinion of the Church of *Rome* be ſo directly oppoſite to it as Monſieur *de Meaux* profeſſes, we are a little ſurpriſed that no *Index Expurgatorius*, no authentick Cenſure, has ever taken notice of ſo dangerous a Prevarication. But contrary-wiſe, theſe are the great Authors of their Party, approved, embraced, and almoſt adored, by the Greateſt and moſt Learned of that Communion.

Theſe are the Principles which we ſuppoſe to have been an unwarrantable derogation to the Grace of God, and directly oppoſite to the nature of *Juſtification* by *Faith in Chriſt*, before eſtabliſhed. And though this point was far from being the *only* cauſe of our Separation from their Communion, yet let Mr. *de Meaux* himſelf pleaſe to ſay, whether ſuch a Doctrine of *Merits* as this were not ſufficient, if not to engage us wholly to leave a

Church

Church that taught ſuch things, yet at leaſt to diſſent from her in theſe Particulars.

ARTIC. VII.

Of Satisfactions, Indulgences, and Purgatory.

Sect. 1. *of Satisfactions.*

THE whole of this Point we think to be the advancement of a Doctrine *grounded upon no Authority of Holy Scripture*, but on the contrary, derogatory to God's Mercy in Jeſus Chriſt, and, as the Doctrine of Merits before conſidered, inconſiſtent with the nature of that *Juſtification* we before eſtabliſh'd.

Monſieur *de Meaux* was pleaſed there to tell us, *of God's juſtifying us freely for Chriſt's Merits: That our Sins are not only covered, but entirely done away by his Mercy; and the Sinner not only reputed, but made juſt by his Grace.* We cannot but be troubled to ſee our ſelves ſo ſoon deprived of this excellent Hope; and required our ſelves to ſatisfy God's Juſtice here, which he aſſured us was entirely done for us by Chriſt before.

"When Chriſt, ſays Monſieur *de Meaux*, who alone was "able to make a ſufficient Satisfaction for our Sins, died "for us; having by his Death abundantly ſatisfied for "them, he became capable of applying that Satisfaction "to us after two very different manners; Either by gi- "ving us an entire Forgiveneſs of our Sins, without reſer- "ving any Pains for us to undergo for them; or in chang- "ing only a greater Pain into a leſſer, the Eternal Tor- "ments of Hell into a Temporal Puniſhment.

See above.

"The former of theſe being the more *intire*, and "the *more agreeable to the Divine Goodneſs*, he accor- "dingly makes uſe of it at our Baptiſm: But *we ſuppoſe* he gives the ſecond only to them who after Baptiſm

Baptiſm fall again into ſin; being in a manner forced to it through the Ingratitude whereby they have abuſed his former Gifts, ſo that they are to ſuffer ſome *Temporal pain*, tho *the Eternal* be remitted to them.

This is a very great Doctrine, and ought certainly to have ſome better Proof of it, than barely *We ſuppoſe*. However it be, our Church has declared its ſelf of an opinion directly contrary; That ſince the abſolute forgiving of Sin is *Confeſſed* to be the more perfect way, and more becoming the Divine Goodneſs; and that God has never, that we know of, revealed any other; but rather has conſtantly encouraged us to expect his Pardon after the largeſt and moſt ample manner that it is poſſible for words to ſet forth; We are perſuaded that accordingly whenever God do's pardon, it is in that way which is the moſt ſuitable to his Divine Goodneſs, and which alone he hath declared to us, that he do's it *intirely for Chriſt's Merits, not for any Works or Sufferings of our own.*

In vain therefore does Monſieur *de Meaux* labour to reconcile this Doctrine with Chriſt's abſolute Satisfaction. "We confeſs *that we ought not to diſpute with* "*God the manner of his Diſpenſations*; *Nor think it at* "*all ſtrange if he who ſhews himſelf ſo eaſie at our Baptiſm,* "*is afterwards more difficult for thoſe Sins which we com-* "*mit being Baptized.* There is nothing in all this but what we could moſt readily allow of, were there but any tolerable Arguments to eſtabliſh the Doctrine that requires it.

But whilſt this is ſo deſtitute of all Proof, that it is acknowledged to introduce a manner of forgiveneſs neither ſo *intire*, nor ſo *befitting God's Mercy* as a total remiſſion of the *Puniſhment*, together with the *Guilt*; whilſt we have the Sufferings of Chriſt to re-

ly upon, which are ſo far from needing any addition of our own, that they *are Confeſſed to* have been *Super-abundant* to whatever the divine Juſtice could require of us; Tho we can and do practiſe the ſame Diſcipline for the other benefits of it, *viz.* To ſhew our Indignation againſt our ſelves that we have offended, and to keep us from ſinning for the future; yet we cannot be ſo forgetful of our dear Maſter, as to pretend to any part of that Redemption, but only to enjoy the benefits of that forgiveneſs, which by his alone Merits he has intirely purchaſed for us; nor do we ſee any reaſon to believe that God's Juſtice will require any more, than what has been *Super-abundantly paid* upon the Croſs for the Iniquities of mankind.

'Tis true, Monſieur *de Meaux* tells us, "*That the* "*neceſſity of this Payment does not ariſe from any de-*"*fect in Chriſt's Satisfaction, but from a certain Order* "*which God has eſtabliſhed for a ſalutary Diſcipline, and* "*to keep us from offending.*

This indeed were ſomething, would either Monſieur *de Meaux* have been pleaſed to ſhew us *this Eſtabliſhment*, or had not the Council of *Trent* declared more, *viz.* "*That the Juſtice of God requires it*; Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 14. c. 8. "*and that therefore the Confeſſors ſhould be charged* "*to proportion the Satisfaction to the Crime.* From whence Cardinal *Bellarmine* concludes, "*That it is* L. 1. de purg. c. 14. "*We who properly ſatisfie for our own Sins, and that* "*Chriſt's Satisfaction ſerves only to make ours valid.* This is an Expoſition ſomewhat different from Monſieur *de Meaux*'s, who will have the Church of *Rome* believe, "*That we do not our ſelves ſatisfie in the leaſt* "*for our Sins, but only apply the infinite Satisfaction of* "*Chriſt to them.*

Upon the whole it appears, 1. That theſe Penances

ces are not only *a Salutary Diſcipline*, but a *Satisfaction* too. 2. They change the Mercy of God into a Forgiveneſs, that is confeſſed neither to be in its ſelf *Perfect*, nor ſo *becoming the Divine Goodneſs* as an intire Remiſſion of Sin, the Puniſhment as well as Guilt, would be. 3. Their Eſtabliſhment depends only upon *a humane Suppoſition of its fitneſs*; and derogates from the very Foundation of that Covenant God has entred into with us by Chriſt, "*That he will be* Hebr. c. 8. v. 12. "*merciful to our Unrighteouſneſs, and our Sins and our* "*Iniquities he will remember no more.* Upon all which accounts, tho we practiſe this Diſcipline for many other benefits of it, and wiſh it were univerſally eſtabliſhed, not only in a more perfect manner than either in Ours or Their Church it is, but even in a ſtrictneſs equal to what they tell us it is fallen from; Catech. conc. Trid. yet we cannot believe, that by any of theſe things we are able to make a true and proper Satisfaction to God for Sin; which he only could do, "*who Him-* "*ſelf bore our Sins in his own Body upon the Croſs, and* Hebr. 10. 14. "*by that one Suffering, for ever perfected them that are* "*Sanctified.*

SECT. II.

Of Indulgences.

THE Doctrine of Indulgences the Council of *Trent* has aſſerted only, not explained: Monſieur *de Meaux* has ſtated it after a manner ſo favourable to us, that I am perſuaded he will find more in his own Church than in ours to oppoſe his Doctrine.

It was the diſcipline of the Primitive Church, when the Biſhops impoſed ſevere Penances on the Offenders, and that they were almoſt quite performed; if ſome great cauſe of pity chanced to arrive, or an excellent Repentance, or danger of Death, or ſome Martyr pleaded in behalf of the Penitent, the Biſhop did ſometimes *Indulge* him, that is, *Did relax the remaining part of his Penance, and give him Abſolution.*

Monſieur *de Meaux* having this Patern before his Eyes, frames the Indulgences now uſed in the Church of *Rome* exactly according to it. "*When the Church,*" ſays he, "*impoſes upon Sinners hard and laborious Pe-*" *nances, and that with Humility they undergo them, this* " *we call Satisfaction; and when having regard either to* " *the fervour of the Penitents, or to ſome other good works* " *which ſhe preſcribes, ſhe relaxes ſome part of the Puniſh-*" *ment yet remaining; This is called Indulgence.*

But to paſs by for the preſent thoſe abuſes that are every day made of theſe Indulgences, and which both the Council and Monſieur *de Meaux* ſeem willing to have redreſſed; ſuch eſſential differences we conceive there are between the Indulgences of the Primitive, and thoſe of the *Roman* Church, that tho we readily enough embrace the One, yet we cannot but renounce and condemn the Other.

In the Primitive Church theſe Indulgences were Matters of *meer Diſcipline*, as *the Penances* alſo were; the One to correct the Sinner, and to give others caution that they might not eaſily offend; the Other to encourage the Penitent to honour the Martyr that interpoſed for his Forgiveneſs, or to prevent his dying without *Abſolution*. In the Church of *Rome* they are founded upon an Errour in Doctrine; that as their Penance is not matter of Diſcipline, only to correct the

the Sinner, but to be undergone as a Satisfaction to be made to God for the Sin; ſo their Indulgence is not given as Monſieur *de Meaux* expounds it, upon any conſideration had *of the fervour of the Penitent*, to admit him to Abſolution which he has already received, but by the application of the *Merits* of their Saints, who they ſuppoſe have undergone more temporal Puniſhments than their Sins have deſerved, to take off that *Pain*, which notwithſtanding their *Abſolution*, the Sinner ſhould otherwiſe have remained liable to.

In the Primitive Church the Biſhop received the Penitent to Abſolution, and the exemplarineſs of his Repentance, or the interceſſion of the Martyr that ſupplicated for him, was the only conſideration they had for the Indulgence. In the Church of *Rome* the Indulgence is to be had from the Pope only, in *whoſe Hands the Merits of their Saints lye*, the overplus of which are, they ſay, *the Treaſure of the Church*, to be diſpenſed upon all occaſions to ſuch as want, and upon ſuch Terms as his Holineſs ſhall think fit to propoſe.

In the Primitive Church theſe Indulgences were very rare, given only upon ſome ſpecial occaſions, and the Biſhop never relaxed the remainder of the Penance he had impoſed, till the Penitent had performed a conſiderable part of it, and ſhew'd by his Contrition that it had obtained the effect of bringing him to a ſenſe of his Sin, and a hearty Repentance for it, which was the end they deſigned by all. In the *Roman* Church they are cry'd about the Streets, hung up in Tables over every Church-Door, proſtituted for Money, offer'd to all Cuſtomers, for themſelves, or for their Friends; for the Dead as well as the Living: and to viſit three Churches, ſay a Prayer before this Altar, at the other Saints Monument, in a third Chappel, is without more

ado

ado, through the extraordinary Charity that Church hath for Sinners, declared ſufficient to take off whatever ſuch Puniſhment is due for all the Sins of a whole Life.

And here then let Monſieur *de Meaux* in conſcience tell us; "*Is all this no more than to releaſe ſome part of* "*the remaining Penance, in conſideration of the fervour* "*of the Penitent* in performing the reſt? Such Pardons as theſe we do certainly with Reaſon conclude, "*to be fond things, vainly invented, and grounded upon* "*no Authority of Holy Scripture, but indeed repugnant* "*to God's Word.* But for the reſt, we profeſs our ſelves ſo far from being enemies to the Ancient Diſcipline of the Church, that we heartily wiſh to ſee it revived; And *whenever the Penances ſhall be reduced to their former practice, we ſhall be ready to give or receive ſuch an Indulgence, as* Monſieur de Meaux *has deſcribed, and as the Primitive Ages of the Church allow'd of.*

See our 22d Artic.

SECT. III.

Of Purgatory.

BUT the Temporal Pains which they ſuppoſe due to Sin, has yet another Error conſequent upon it. That ſince every man muſt undergo them according to the proportion of his Sins, if any one chance to dye before he has ſo done, he cannot paſs directly into Heaven, but muſt undergo theſe puniſhments firſt in the other Life; and the place where theſe Puniſhments are undergone, they call *Purgatory.*

So that the Doctrine then of Purgatory, relies upon that Satisfaction which we our ſelves are to make for

for our Sins, beſides what Chriſt has done for us: And according to the meaſure that that is, either true or falſe, certain or uncertain, this muſt be ſo too: Since therefore Monſieur *de Meaux* tells us only, that the Church of *Rome* ſuppoſes the former to be true, they can only ſuppoſe the latter in like manner; and therefore till they are able certainly to aſſure us of that, we ſhall ſtill have reaſon to doubt of this.

That the Primitive Church from the very ſecond Century, made *Prayers for the Dead*, we do not deny; But, that theſe Prayers were to deliver them out of Purgatory, this we ſuppoſe Monſieur *de Meaux* himſelf will not avow; it being certain that they were made for the beſt Men, for the Holy Apoſtles, the Martyrs and Confeſſors of the Church, nay for the Bleſſed Virgin her ſelf, all which at the ſame time they thought in happineſs, and who the Papiſts themſelves tell us never toucht at Purgatory.

Many were the private Opinions which the particular Chriſtians of old had concerning the reaſon and Benefit of *Praying for the Dead.* Some then, as we do at this day, only gave thanks to God for their Faith and their Examples. Others prayed for them, either for the Bodies Reſurrection, or for their acquitting at the final Judgment, as ſuppoſing it to be no way unfit to pray to God for thoſe very Bleſſings which he has abſolutely promiſed and reſolved to give. Some thought an Increaſe of Glory might be obtained to the Righteous by their Prayers. All believed this, that it teſtified their hope of them, and manifeſted their Faith of that Future Reſurrection which they waited for; and in the mean time maintained a kind of Fellowſhip and Communion between the Members of Chriſt yet alive, and thoſe who were departed only, not loſt by Death.

But

But then it is to be obſerved, that when they moſt ordinarily prayed for the Dead, yet was there nothing *determined* as to this other Point; all was left to the Piety and Opinion of *particular Men*, nor durſt they abſolutely reſolve whether the Dead received any benefit by them; as both the learned of the Church of *Rome* themſelves confeſs, and the Writings of Primitive Antiquity, even to St. *Auguſtine* himſelf, undoubtedly ſhew.

Now as there is none of us that will condemn the Charity of any Man, to Pray, or Faſt, or Afflict himſelf for the Pardon and Forgiveneſs of his Friends, his Country, or his Church, ſo it be done without any fond Opinion of *Merit* or *Satisfaction*, and to hope too by ſuch Prayers to obtain God's Mercy for them: So if any one will put up his particular Requeſts for the Dead too, for any of thoſe Ends for which the Primitive Chriſtians did, we ſhall not condemn him. Only let not that be made an *Article of our Faith* which we can never be aſſured of, and which when it was moſt practiſed, was received only as a *private Opinion*, and in a Senſe far different from what is now aſſerted; And for the reſt *We ſhall not refuſe to conſent to any Liberty whereby Peace may be obtained, and our free Juſtification by Faith in Chriſt not injured.*

PART

PART II.

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

ARTICLE VIII.

Of the Sacraments in General.

THE Doctrine of the Sacraments has always been esteemed one of the most considerable Obstacles to our Union with the Church of *Rome*. We cannot imagine why Monsieur *de Meaux* should insinuate as if our Disputes about these, except it be in the point of the Eucharist, *were not so great as about other Matters*, unless it be to serve for an excuse for his own passing so lightly over them, or to make us less careful in examining their Doctrine.

The *Sacraments* of the New Testament, in that *proper sense* in which we now take the Word, we have always look'd upon to be not only "Holy *Signs* to "represent and confirm to us the Grace of God, but "also effectual Tokens of his good Will to us, by which "he does work invisibly in us, and strengthen and "confirm our Faith in him.

To obtain the benefit of the Holy Sacraments, we cannot believe it to be enough that we have *no ill*

diſpoſition, but do ſuppoſe that it is a ſufficient Obſtacle if we have not a *good one*. We confeſs that the Faith of the Church, and thoſe who preſent them to Baptiſm, is all that is required to prepare Infants to receive the ſpiritual Regeneration which that Sacrament confers. But for thoſe who by Age are capable of it, we ſuppoſe both in Baptiſm and in the holy Euchariſt, an actual Faith of God's Promiſe annexed to the outward Signs which we receive, to be indiſpenſibly neceſſary for the partaking of their Effects.

Artic. 25. of the Church of *England*.

And tho if the reſt be agreed, we ſhall not deſire to determine any Man's belief, as to the *manner* how the Sacraments confer that Grace which God has promiſed by them; yet we judg it more agreeable to the Analogy of our Faith to ſay, That upon the performance of the outward Ceremony, God beſtows the inward Bleſſing; than that the Bleſſing is conferr'd *by virtue of the Words which are pronounced, and the action which is done to us*, as Monſieur *de Meaux* has expounded it.

We do not by this at all take off from the neceſſity of the outward Signs. We confeſs, "That beſides the "inward Preparation, there is required for our Sanctifi- "cation *a ſpecial operation of the Holy Spirit, and an* "*application of Chriſt's Merits by the means of the Holy* "*Sacraments*. This we are ſo perſuaded of, that we profeſs them to be * *neceſſary to Salvation*, inſomuch that whoſoever either careleſly neglects, or preſumptuouſly deſpiſes the uſe of them, will in vain expect it by any other means.

* So our Chur. Catechiſm.

For the number of the Sacraments, we acknowledg *only two as generally neceſſary to Salvation*; and are ſurprized to ſee the Council of *Trent* damning all ſuch as will not receive a number, which neither has the Scripture any

any where declared; nor was it, that we know of, till the very 12*th* Century ever heard of in the Church. * *Hugo de St. Victor* is the firſt that we can find it in, 1130 Years after Chriſt; † *Lombard* and the School-men follow'd him. Pope ‖ *Eugenius* in his inſtructions to the *Armenians* gave yet more countenance to it; but that all thoſe Ceremonies which the Church of *Rome* now receives are truly and properly Sacraments, and that there be neither more nor leſs than *Seven*, never any one abſolutely determined, till the Council of *Trent* firſt Canonically decreed it, and commanded the Church under an *Anathema* to receive it.

* De Cerm. Ec. &c. l. 1. c. 12.
† Lib. 4. Sent. Diſt. 2.
‖ Ann. 1439. in Conc. Flor.

The ſpecial conſideration of their *five pretended Sacraments*, will give us an opportunity more particularly to eſtabliſh that number we our ſelves propoſe.

This preſumption of the Truth we muſt not omit here, That not only the Ancient Fathers of the Church when they ſpeak of the Sacraments *properly* as we now do, mention only *Baptiſm* and *the Lord's Supper*; but even the Papiſts themſelves who eſtabliſh more, yet confeſs theſe to be ſo far the Principal, that our own *Article* ſays but little more, than what their greateſt *School-men* have voluntarily confeſſed.

ARTICLE IX.

Of Baptiſm.

HOW ſtrict our Church is in maintaining the neceſſity of Baptiſm, the very Office by which we do adminiſter it, ſufficiently ſhews. We declare that " *all Men are conceived and born in Sin, and that none*

See our Office of Pub. Bapt.

" *none can enter into the Kingdom of God, except he be* " *regenerate and born a-new of Water, and of the Spirit.* This is the Law of Chriſt which the Eternal Truth has eſtabliſhed; and whoſoever ſhall preſume to oppoſe it, let him be *Anathema.*

But now as all other Laws, ſo this of Chriſt, muſt, we think, be interpreted according to the rules of natural Equity. The Ancient Church conſtantly profeſſed her belief, that Martyrdom excuſed the defect of Baptiſm. Many of the Papiſts themſelves ſuppoſe, that *the deſire of it*, when by ſome unavoidable neceſſity the Sacrament it ſelf cannot be obtained, ſhall be reputed for it. Monſieur *de Meaux* inſinuates that *the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity*, may ſupply the want of it. * St. *Bernard* plainly concludes the ſame, " If, ſays he, a Man *deſirous* of Baptiſm be ſuddenly " cut off by Death, in whom there wanted neither " ſound *Faith*, nor devout *Hope*, nor ſincere *Charity*; " God be Merciful unto me, and pardon me if I err, " but verily *of ſuch a Ones Salvation in whom there is* " *no other defect but his faultleſs lack of Baptiſm, deſpair* " *I cannot*, nor induce my Mind to think his *Faith* " void, his *Hope* confounded, and his *Charity* fallen to " nothing, only becauſe he hath not that which *not* " *Contempt, but Impoſſibility* with-holdeth.

* Ep. 70. if it be indeed his.

When therefore ſo many ways have been allowed to excuſe the defect of Baptiſm, tho our Church has rather taken all imaginable care that Infants ſhall not die without it, than preſumed raſhly to determine what ſhall become of them if they do; yet we cannot but condemn the uncharitableneſs of the Church of *Rome* in " *Excluding them from all part in Jeſus Chriſt*, and denying that Mercy to a tender and impotent Age, which they ſo liberally extend to thoſe of riper Years.

If

If not the *Want* but the *Contempt* of this Sacrament be the only thing that is damnable, to be ſure no Contempt of Baptiſm can be in them. If the deſire of Baptiſm in thoſe that are capable of it, is by many of their own Church confeſſed to be reputed for Baptiſm; why ſhall we not hope that God who is all merciful, will accept the *Deſire* of the Church and of their Parents in their behalf, who by their Age are not capable to have any of their own. * If *Faith, Hope* and *Charity*, as Monſieur *de Meaux* himſelf implies, may excuſe them who actually have theſe Graces, tho they want this Sacrament; why may not that Faith, that Hope, that Charity of the Church, which being imputed to them renders them capable of Baptiſm, be as effectual to ſtand inſtead of it to them, as their own proper Faith for Others, if a neceſſity which could not be avoided prevents it?

* By Monſieur de Meaux, *ſit before.*

In a word, Since ſuch is the Mercy of God, that to things altogether impoſſible he bindeth no Man; but where what he Commands cannot be performed, accepteth of our Will to do it inſtead of the Deed. 2. Seeing God's Grace is not ſo abſolutely tyed to the Sacraments, but that many exceptions have been, and are ſtill confeſſed to be ſufficient to obtain it, without the external Application of them: Seeing, 3. St. *Paul* has told us that *the Seed of faithful Parentage is Holy from the very Birth*, as being born within the Covenant of Grace; Tho we determine nothing, yet we think it the part of Charity, not only to take all the care we can to preſent our Infants to Baptiſm whilſt they live, but if by any unavoidable neceſſity they ſhould die without it, † to Hope well of them: Remembring that Judgment of God, *Exod.* 4. who when *Moſes* neglected to Circumciſe his Son, ſpared the Child in that

1 Cor. 7.

† *See* Caſſan. Conſult. Art. 9. & de Bapt. Infant. *Where he cites many others of the* Ch. *of* Rome *of the ſame Opinion.*

that he was innocent, but ſought to kill *Moſes* for his Careleſneſs in the Omiſſion.

A neceſſity therefore of Baptiſm we conſtantly maintain; but abſolutely to determine that all thoſe who die without it, are excluded from the Grace of Chriſt, neither will Monſieur *de Meaux* preſume to do of Men, nor dare we much leſs to affirm it of Infants. The *Lutherans* condemn the *Anabaptiſts* for refuſing Baptiſm altogether to Children, which we alſo condemn in them. But that therefore they make no allowance for extraordinary Caſes, where both the Church and the Parents deſired to have Baptized them, only that ſome unavoidable Accident prevented it, neither did *Caſſander* believe, nor do the terms of their Confeſſion at all require. For the *Calviniſts*, ſo far were they from being the Authors of this charitable opinion towards Infants dying unbaptized, *That many of the moſt Eminent Men of the Church of* * Rome *have long before them maintained the ſame.*

Conſult. Art. 9.

* Gerſon. Gabriel Biel, Cajetan, *and others.*

To conclude, If Monſieur *de Meaux* himſelf do's in good earneſt believe the danger ſo great as he pretends; may he then pleaſe to conſider, *What we are to judge of thoſe who in ſo many places have not left any Miniſters at all to confer this Sacrament.* For our parts we muſt freely declare we think their hazard to be infinitely greater than either the Children or their Parents; who are ſo far from that indifference Monſieur *de Meaux* moſt injuriouſly charges them with, that in places where publick Miniſters reſide, that they have the opportunity to do it, they fail not with all imaginable care to Preſent them in the Ambaſſador's Chappels to Baptiſm, if they have but the leaſt apprehenſion that they are not in a condition to be carried to their own Temples.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE X.

Of Confirmation.

TO clear our way to that particular Examination we are to make of the following *pretended Sacraments* of the *Roman* Church, it will be neceſſary to obſerve, that by their own Confeſſion theſe three things are abſolutely required to the *Eſſence* of a *true Sacrament*. 1. *Chriſt's Inſtitution*. 2. *An outward and viſible Sign*. 3. *An inward and ſpiritual Grace*, by Chriſt's Promiſe annexed to that Sign.

We cannot but admire, that neither in the Council of *Trent*, or in the Catechiſm made by its Order, is there any Attempt to prove either of theſe from the Holy Scripture as to the Point of Confirmation. It was ſo much the more neceſſary to have done this, in that *Many* of the greateſt Note in the *Roman* Church *had denied the Divine Inſtitution of it*; and ſome of them were approved by the *Holy See* it ſelf that did it. *The outward Sign* has been none of the leaſt Controverſies that have exerciſed their own Pens: and indeed ſince they have laid aſide that of *Impoſition of Hands* which they confeſs the Apoſtles uſed; it was but reaſonable to have ſhewn us ſome Authority for that other they have eſtabliſhed in its ſtead. What Monſieur *de Meaux* expounds, is a clear Vindication of our Practice, but defends nothing of their own Doctrine.

That we think it to have been an Ancient Cuſtom in the Church, and which the very Apoſtles themſelves

ſelves practiſed, to *lay Hands* on thoſe that had been baptized; and in imitation whereof we our ſelves at this day do the like, the Conſtitutions of our Church ſufficiently declare.

We confeſs that the uſe of *Chriſm* in Confirmation was very Ancient, yet ſuch as we deny to have been *Apoſtolical*. We do not our ſelves uſe it, yet were that all the difference between us, we ſhould be far from judging thoſe that did.

The Diſcipline of our Church allows none that is not of the Epiſcopal Order to Confirm. And for the benefit of it, as the Biſhop prays to God for his Holy Spirit to aſſiſt us in the way of Vertue and Religion, to Arm us againſt Temptation, and to enable us to keep our *Baptiſmal Covenant which we then* (our ſelves repeat, and) *in the Preſence of the Church openly ratify and confirm*: So we Pioully hope that the Bleſſing of the Holy Spirit deſcends upon us, through his Prayer, for all theſe great Ends; both to ſtrengthen the Grace we already have, and to increaſe it in us to a more plentiful degree.

ARTICLE XI.

Of Penance and Confeſſion.

FOR *Penance* and *Confeſſion*, we wiſh our Diſcipline were both more ſtrictly required, and more duly obſerved than it is, The *Canons of our Church* do perhaps require as much as the Primitive Chriſtians themſelves did: and it is more *the decay of Piety* in the People, than any want of Care in her, that they are not as well and regularly practiſed. We

We do not believe *Penance* to be a Sacrament after the ſame manner that Baptiſm and the Holy Euchariſt are; becauſe neither do we find any Divine Command for it, nor is there any Sign in it eſtabliſhed by Chriſt, to which his Grace is annexed. We ſuppoſe that if the ancient Church had eſteemed it any thing more than a part of Chriſtian Diſcipline, they would not have preſumed to make ſuch changes in it, as in the ſeveral Ages it is evident they did.

The Primitive Chriſtians interpreting thoſe places of * St. *Matthew* and St. *John*, which Monſieur *de Meaux* mentions, of publick Diſcipline, and to which we ſuppoſe with them they principally at leaſt, if not only refer, *at firſt* practiſed no other. For private Faults, they exhorted their Penitents to Confeſs them to God, and unleſs ſome particular Circumſtances required the Communication of them to the Prieſt, plainly ſignified that that Confeſſion was not only in it ſelf ſufficient, but in effect was more agreeable to Holy Scripture, than any other.

* Mat. 18. 18. John 20. 23.

If the Conſcience indeed were too much burdened by ſome *great Fault*; or that the Crime committed was *notoriouſly Scandalous*, then they adviſed a Confeſſion to the Prieſt too. But this was not to every Prieſt, nor for him juſt to hear the Confeſſion, and then without more ado to ſay *I abſolve thee*; They preſcribed in every Church ſome wiſe Phyſician of the Soul on purpoſe for this great Charge, that might pray with the Penitent; might direct him what to do to obtain God's Favour; might aſſiſt him in it; and finally, after a long Experience, and a ſevere Judgment, give him Abſolution.

This was the practice of the *Eaſtern Church*; till upon occaſion of a *certain Scandal*, *Nectarius* firſt began to weaken it in his Church at *Conſtantinople*; and St. *J. Chryſoſtom* his Succeſſor ſeconded him in it. They reduced the Practice to what it had been in the Beginning; that open and ſcandalous Sins ſhould be openly puniſhed by the pub-

lick Discipline of the Church, and the private be Confessed only to God Almighty.

Yet still the publick Confession remained in the practice of the *Western Church* *Pope Leo* I. to take away the occasions of Fear and Shame that kept many from the exercise of it, first ordered, that it should be sufficient to Confess to God and the Priest only; which is the first plausible Pretence offered by them for Auricular Confession.

Thus this Practice, now set up for a Sacrament instituted by our Saviour, and absolutely necessary to obtain God's Pardon, first began. But the performance of it was yet left to every Man's liberty. About 1215 Years after Christ, the Council of *Lateran* first commanded it to be of necessary Observance: But we do not find that till the Council of *Trent* in the last Age, it was ever required to be received absolutely *as a Sacrament of Divine Institution*, and *necessary to Salvation*.

This short view of the practice of Antiquity in this point, may be sufficient to shew, that unless it were the publick power of the Church to censure open and scandalous Offenders, which was the Key of Discipline our Blessed Saviour left to it; for the rest, several Churches and Ages had their several Practices. They advised private Confession as upon many accounts, which Monsieur *de Meaux* Remarks, and which we willingly allow, very useful to the Penitent: but it was not for above 1000 Years ever looked upon as *absolutely necessary*, nor by Consequence as *Sacramental*.

The *Church of England* refuses no sort of Confession either publick or private, which may be any way necessary to the quieting of Mens Consciences; or to the exercising of that *Power of binding and loosing*, which our Saviour Christ has left to his Church.

We have our Penitential Canons for publick Offenders: We exhort Men if they have any the least doubt or Scruple, nay sometimes tho they have none, but especially be-

before they receive the Holy Sacrament, to confess their Sins. We propose to them the benefit not only of Ghostly Advice how to manage their Repentance, but the great comfort of *Absolution* too, as soon as they shall have compleated it.

Our form of Absolution after the manner of the *Eastern Church* at this day, and of the Universal Church for above 1200 Years, is *Declarative* rather than *Absolute*. Whilst we are unable to search the Hearts of Men, and thereby infallibly to discern the sincerely Contrite, from those that are not; we think it Rashness to pronounce a *definitive Sentence in God's Name, which we cannot be sure that God will always confirm.*

When we visit our Sick, we never fail to exhort them to make a *special Confession* of their Sins to him that ministers to them: And when they have done it, the *Absolution* is so full, that the Church of *Rome* it self could not desire to add any thing to it.

For the rest; We think it an *unnecessary Rack to Mens Consciences* to oblige them where there is no Scruple, to reveal to their Confessor every the most secret Fault, even of Wish or Desire, which the Church of *Rome* exacts. Nor dare we pronounce this Discipline *Sacramental*, and *necessary to Salvation*; so that a contrite Sinner, who has made his Confession to God Almighty, shall not receive a Pardon, unless he repeat it to the Priest too.

This we must beg leave with assurance to say is directly contrary to the Tradition of the Church, and to many plain and undoubted places of Holy Scripture. And if this be all our Reformation be guilty of, that we advise not that which may torment and distract, but is no way apt to settle Mens Consciences; nor require that as indispensibly necessary to Salvation, which we find no where commanded by God as such, we assure Monsieur *de Meaux* we see no cause at all either to *regret the Loss*, or to be *ashamed of the Change.*

ARTICLE XII.

Of Extream Unction.

OF all those *pretended Sacraments* of the *Roman* Church that have no foundation in holy Scripture, this seems to stand the fairest for it. Here is both an outward and visible Sign, and an inward and spiritual Grace tied to it. Insomuch that Monsieur *de Meaux* himself, who never attempted to say any thing of it in the two foregoing Instances, yet fails not to put us in mind of it in this.

1 James 5. 14, 15.

To interpret rightly that place of St. *James* which is alledged to prove it, we must remark, that *anointing with Oyl* was one of those *Ceremonies* used by the Apostles in working their miraculous Cures, Mark 6. 13. *They cast out Devils*, says the Evangelist, *and anointed many sick persons with Oyl, and cured them.* Sometimes they used only *Imposition of Hands*, and sometimes they did it without either.

Together with these *outward Signs* they usually added *Prayer* too, some Invocation at least in the Name of *Jesus Christ*, as the more substantial & more effectual Assistance.

So that St. *James*'s Direction there, "*If any Man be sick, "let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray "over him, anointing him with Oyl in the Name of the Lord, "and the Prayer of Faith shall save the Sick, and the Lord "shall raise him up*; referring, as is evident, to those *miraculous Cures* which the Apostles and their Successors in the Primitive Church wrought by such anointing. We look upon it, that the advice, in as much as it belonged to that, could neither have been the Institution of a Sacrament at all; and that, together with the miraculous power of healing, it is now long since ceased in the Church.

‖ Vid. Sacram. Greg. p. 66. Et Rursus 251. & seqq. Menard. annot. 3 MSS. & alia ejusd. opin.

Monsieur *de Meaux* ought not to refuse this Interpretation: ‖ The Ancient Rituals of the *Roman* Church for above 800 Years after Christ, shew that they esteemed this to be the

the meaning of it; they understand it plainly of bodily Cures; and Cardinal *Cajetan* himself freely confesses that it can belong to no other. Cajet. Annot. in loc.

Our Saviour and his Apostles, when they thus miraculously healed the Infirmity of the Body, at the same time usually forgave the Sin of the Soul too; For this cause St. *James* adds, "*And IF he have committed Sins, they* "*shall be forgiven him.*"

Tho this extraordinary Power be now ceased both in the one and the other kind, yet we still endeavour to perform whatever we are capable of on these occasions: We send for the Elders of the Church when we are sick, they pray over us; if we stand charged with any private Sins or publick Censures, we confess them to them, and they fail not by their Absolution, as far as in them lies, to forgive us.

This is all, we think, is now remaining for us to fulfil of what this Text requires; We *anoint not* our Sick for the recovery of their *bodily Health*, as St. *James* here prescribed, because the miraculous power of healing, to which that Ceremony ministred, is ceased in the Church. We pray over them, if it please God, for the recovery of their present Health, but especially for their Eternal Salvation: We exercise *the power of the Keys* to the forgiveness of their Sins, because the benefit of this is the same now that ever it was; Christ's Promise remains, and whilst we piously make use of the same means, we doubt not but it shall be to the like Effect.

ARTICLE XIII.

Of Marriage.

FOR the point of Marriage, Monsieur *de Meaux* says nothing but what we willingly allow of: We deny that it is a ‖ Sacrament after the same manner that Baptism and ‖ Lomb. of our side. See Cassand. Con.

and the Holy Eucharist are, because it both wants an *outward Sign* to which by Christ's Promise a *Blessing* is annexed; and is so far from being *generally necessary to Salvation*, as they are, and as we suppose all true and proper Sacraments ought to be, that the Church of *Rome* has thought fit to deny one of the most considerable parts of their Communion altogether the use of it.

ARTICLE XIV.

Of Holy Orders.

THE *Imposition of Hands* in Holy Orders, being accompanied with a Blessing of the Holy Spirit, may perhaps upon that account be called a kind of *Particular Sacrament*. Yet since that Grace which is thereby conferr'd, whatever it be, is not common to all Christians, nor by consequence any part of that Foederal Blessing which our Blessed Saviour has purchased for us; but only a separation of him who receives it to a special Employ; we think it ought not to be esteemed a common Sacrament of the whole Church, as *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* are.

The outward sign of it we confess to have been usually *Imposition of Hands*, and as such we our selves observe it; Yet as we do not read that Christ himself instituted that Sign, much less tied the promise of any certain Grace to it; so Monsieur *de Meaux* may please to consider, that there are many of his *own Communion*, that do not think it to be essential to *Holy Orders*, nor by consequence the *outward sign* of a Sacrament in them.

We confess that no Man ought to exercise the Ministerial Office till he be first consecrated to it. We believe that it is the Bishops part only to Ordain. We maintain the distinction of the several Orders in the Church; and tho we have none of those below a Deacon, because we do

do not read that the Apoſtles had any, yet we acknowledg the reſt to have been anciently received in the Church, and ſhall not therefore raiſe any Controverſie about them.

ARTICLE XV.

Of the Euchariſt.

And firſt of the Explication of thoſe Words, This is my Body.

IN our entry upon this Point, we cannot but teſtify our juſt regret, That this Holy Sacrament which was deſigned by our Bleſſed Saviour, not only to be the greateſt aſſurance of his love to us, but the ſtrongeſt Engagement of our Charity to one another, ſhould have become the chiefeſt ſubject of our Contentions, and widened that Breach which it ought to have cloſed.

Monſieur *de Meaux*, who grounds his opinion of the *Corporeal Preſence* of Chriſt in this Holy Euchariſt, upon the words of Inſtitution, which he contends ought to be litterally underſtood, yet propoſes two Caſes wherein he ſeems to allow it might have been lawful to forſake the Letter. We will join iſſue with him upon his own terms, and ſhew, "1. *That there are ſuch grounds in thoſe words* "*for a figurative interpretation, as naturally lead to it.* 2. *That* "*when we come to conſider the Intention of our Saviour in* "*this Holy Sacrament, we are yet more ſtrongly confirmed in it.*

It is confeſſed by the greateſt Authors of the Church of *Rome*, that if the Relative *This*, in that Propoſition, *This is my Body*, refers to that Bread which our Saviour Chriſt held in his Hand at the time when he ſpoke thoſe Words, the natural repugnancy there is between the two things affirmed of one another, *Bread* and *Chriſt's Body*, will neceſſarily require the *figurative interpretation*. For "*this* "*is impoſſible*, ſays * *Gratian*, *That Bread ſhould be the Body*

* Gratian de Conſecrat. d. 2. c. 55.

† L. 3. de Euch. c. 19. SS. Primum. ‖ Id. ib. l. 1. c. 1.

" *dy of Chriſt. It cannot be,* ſays † Card. *Bellarmine, That* " *that Propoſition ſhould be true, the former part whereof de-* " *ſigneth Bread, the latter the Body of Chriſt.* ‖ *So that if* " *the Senſe be, This Bread is the Body of Chriſt, either it* " *muſt be taken Figuratively thus, This Bread ſignifies the* " *Body of Chriſt, or it is plainly abſurd and impoſſible.* The whole difficulty therefore as to our firſt point conſiſts in this, Whether our Saviour Chriſt when he ſaid, *This is my Body*, meant any thing elſe to be his *Body*, than that *Bread* which was before him.

Now for this, the Connexion of his Diſcourſe ſeems to us an evident Demonſtration. " *Our Saviour Chriſt took* " *Bread, and gave Thanks, and brake it, and gave it to his* Luk. 22. 19. " *Diſciples, ſaying, Take, Eat, This is my Body which is* " *given for you; do this in Remembrance of me.*

For what did he demonſtrate here, and ſay was his *Body*, but that which he *gave to his Diſciples?* What did he *give to his Diſciples*, but that which *he brake?* What *brake he*, but that *which he took?* And St. *Luke* ſays expreſly, *he took Bread.*

What Jeſus *took in his Hands*, that *He bleſſed:* what *He bleſſed*, the ſame *He brake and gave to his Diſciples:* What he *gave to his Diſciples*, of that he ſaid, *This is my Body:* But Jeſus, ſays the Text, *took Bread; of the Bread* therefore he ſaid, *This is my Body.*

In a word; Foraſmuch as the Papiſts themſelves believe the *Bread* to be turned into the ſubſtance of *Chriſt*'s *Body*, becauſe Chriſt ſaid *This is my Body:* Either thoſe words refer to the *Bread*, and then by their own Confeſſion they will require our Interpretation; or if they do not, it is evident that then from theſe Words they can have no Grounds to conclude their own pretended change.

So neceſſarily do both the Words themſelves and their own Confeſſion, lead us to the Expoſition which we make of them. And what theſe prepare us to receive, the ſame, 2dly, " *The Intention of our Saviour in this Holy Sacrament,* " *do's yet more ſtrongly confirm to us.* When

When God delivered the Childreu of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*, he inſtituted the Paſſover to be a continual Remembrance of that great Deliverance. In like manner our Bleſſed Saviour being now about to work out a much greater Deliverance for us, by offering up himſelf upon the Croſs for our Redemption, he deſign'd by this Sacrament to continue the memory of this Bleſſing, That "*as often* "*as we eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, we might* "*ſhew forth the Lords Death till his coming.*" 1 Cor. 11. 26.

That this Sacrament inſtituted for the like end which the Paſſover had been, and now for ever to ſucceed in its place, might be both the better underſtood, and the eaſier received by them, it pleaſed our Bleſſed Lord to accommodate himſelf as near as was poſſible to the *Ceremonies* and *Phraſes* they had before been uſed to. He retain'd the *Symbols*, and even the *Expreſſions* they had ſo long been acquainted with; only he changed the application of them to a new and more excellent *Remembrance*.

In the *Jewiſh* Paſſover, the Maſter of the Houſe took Bread, and brake it, and gave it to them, ſaying, "*This is* "*the Bread of Affliction, which our Fathers eat in Egypt.*" In this holy Sacrament, our Saviour after the very ſame manner, took Bread, and brake it, and gave it to them, ſaying, "*This is my Body which is broken for you; Do this in Remembrance of Me.*"

Now as it is evident, that that *Bread* which the *Jews* every Year took, and brake, and ſaid, "*This is the Bread of* "*Affliction which our Fathers eat in Egypt*," was not that very Bread which their Anceſtors ſo many Generations before had eaten there; but was deſign'd only to be the *Type* or *Figure* of it: So neither could our Saviour's Diſciples to whom he ſpake, and who, as being *Jews*, had ſo long been acquainted with that Phraſe, ever believe, that *the Bread* which he held in his Hand, which *he brake* and *gave them*, ſaying, "*This is my Body which is broken for you; Do this in*

Remembrance of Me, was the very actual real Body of Chriſt which they ſaw before them at the Table. They underſtood it, no doubt, to be the *Type* and *Figure* of that *Body* which was now about to be broken for them; as that *Bread* which the Maſter of the Feaſt, after the very ſame manner, was wont *to break* to them, was the *Type* of that *Bread of Affliction* which their Fathers had eaten in *Egypt*.

Nor does the Phraſe, *My Body*, at all weaken, but rather confirm this *Idea*, as being the ordinary expreſſion among the *Jews*, whereby they called the Paſſover, *The body of the Paſſover, The body of the Paſchal Lamb*. It was therefore uſed here by our Saviour with that alluſion, the more expreſly to ſignify, that he was the *true Paſſover* now to be ſacrificed for us, by whoſe Blood we were to be delivered from the deſtroying Angel, and for the Remembrance whereof, we were therefore to keep this Ceremony, as the *Jews* had done their Paſſover for the other.

1 Cor. 5. 7.

This we ſuppoſe to be the undoubted Interpretation of this place. Monſieur *de Meaux* ought the leſs to except againſt it, in that it was the original remark, not of any *Proteſtant*, or of any other Party of Chriſtians differing from the Church of *Rome* in this matter, but was objected to them by the very *Jews* themſelves long before the *Reformation*, upon the ſame account. They ſhew'd by it, that in the Doctrine of this pretended Change, the Church of *Rome* had evidently oppoſed the deſign of our Saviour's Inſtitution, and advanced an *Interpretation*, which no one accuſtomed to the *Jewiſh Notions*, as the Apoſtles were, could ever have underſtood to be his meaning.

The deſign of this diſcourſe permits me not to proceed to any more particular vindication of this Expoſition, nor to mention many other Arguments more uſually propoſed; and wherein it has clearly been ſhewn, that they have not only the *Holy Scripture*, and the *deſign of our Bleſſed Saviour* in this Sacrament, but *Senſe*, *Reaſon*, *Antiquity*, whatſoever

ſoever is able to furniſh an Argument, all unanimouſly againſt them: It remains only to examine whether what Monſieur *de Meaux* has propoſed, be any thing more reaſonable, that ſo we may go on to the Conſequences eſtabliſhed upon this Foundation.

Where firſt we cannot conceive why Monſieur *de Meaux*, deſigning to eſtabliſh the Expoſition of the Holy Euchariſt upon the Analogy which it has to the *Jewiſh Sacrifices*, ſhould fly off to the nature of their *Sacrifices in general*, where the parallel is neither ſo clear, nor ſo uncontroverted, as to produce any neceſſary conſequence from the alluſion. It would certainly have been more reaſonable to compare it, as we have done, with that particular *Sacrifice* of the *Paſſover* to which it ſucceeded, and from which therefore, if any, muſt be ſhewed the deſign of it. But we will clear the whole difficulty in a Reflection or two, and prove, that what has been offered to us as a *convincing Argument*, is, upon a nearer view, *a meer Fallacy*.

And 1. We deſire it may be obſerved, That the *Peace-Offerings* under the Law were deſigned as an acknowledgment on the Peoples part, for thoſe temporal Bleſſings which it pleaſed God to beſtow upon them. And becauſe after the *Sacrifice of Iſaac*, God firſt entred into the *Covenant* with *Abraham*, and promiſed him his Bleſſing, and to be his God, and the God of his Seed after him; it ſeems to have been further their intention in all theſe Sacrifices, to call to remembrance *that Offering of Iſaac* as the foundation of all thoſe Bleſſings for which theſe Sacrifices were appointed as a teſtimony of their Gratitude. Gen. 22. 16, *&c.*

2. That tho the *Paſſover*, like the *Sacrifice of the Croſs*, was firſt offered as a *Sin-offering* for the delivery of the firſt-born in the Land of *Egypt*; yet that yearly remembrance of it, which God afterwards eſtabliſh'd, was always eſteemed a *Peace-Offering*; and indeed, the perpetual order of their Sacrifices clearly demonſtrates that it could be no other.

So that the Parallel therefore, for the explaining the nature of the Holy Euchariſt, muſt be this:

1. That as the Jews ate of their *Peace-Offerings* in General, to call to mind the *Sacrifice of Iſaac*, and give God thanks for thoſe Bleſſings which they received by it; and of that of the *Paſſover* in particular, in memory of *God's delivering them out of Egypt*: So the Chriſtians partake of this *bleſſed Sacrament*, in memory of that deliverance which the *Sacrifice of the Croſs of Chriſt*, whom both *Iſaac* and the *Paſchal Lamb* ſlain in *Egypt* typified, has purchaſed for them.

2. That as the *Peace-offering* which the *Jews* ate, was not changed into the *Subſtance* of that firſt Sacrifice whereof it was the remembrance, but was eaten as a *figure* or *commemoration* of it; ſo the Chriſtians in their Sacrament are not to think the *Bread and Wine* which Chriſt has appointed to be our *Peace-offering*, ſhould be changed into the very *ſubſtance of that Body which was offered for us upon the Croſs*, but to be received only as *Types* of it. For thus was the *Peace-offering* in general, a *Type of Iſaac*, and the *Paſſover* in particular, the *Type* of that firſt *Lamb*, which was ſlain for their deliverance in the Land of *Egypt*.

When therefore Monſieur *de Meaux* tells us, that the *Jews* ate the *proper fleſh* of their *Peace-offering*: we anſwer, that ſo do we the *proper ſubſtance* of ours; we eat the *Bread* which Chriſt appointed to be the *remembrance* of that deliverance which he has purchaſed for us, as *the Body of the Lamb* was commanded by God to be the remembrance of theirs.

Monſieur *de Meaux* adds, That the *Jews* were forbidden to parrake of the proper fleſh of their *Sin-offering*, and of *the Blood*, becauſe that a *perfect Remiſſion was not then obtain'd*, and that therefore by *the Rule of Contraries*, we ought now to eat of Ours, becauſe a full ſatisfaction is now made by Chriſt.

For reply to which, it might ſuffice to ſay, that this *rule of Contraries*, ſhould we follow it according to the Letter, would

would lead Monſieur *de Meaux* into ſo many Abſurdities, that he would be forced himſelf to abjure his own Principle. According to this Rule, the Apoſtles could not have eaten the Fleſh of Chriſt before his Reſurrection; the Prieſts under the Law being commanded not to eat of the Sin-Offering *after the third day*, and therefore by *the rule of Contraries* they could not partake of it *before*.

Monſieur *de Meaux* may pleaſe to conſider how far he will approve of this Concluſion: In the mean time as to his Objection, we have before ſaid, that the remembrance we make in the Holy Euchariſt, like that of the *Paſchal Feaſt* among the *Jews*, ſhews it to be a *Peace-Offering*; and for the reſt, if, as Monſieur *de Meaux* pretends the *Blood* was myſtically forbid under the Law, to ſhew that a perfect remiſſion of Sins was not then obtain'd; It will follow, that for the contrary reaſon, Chriſt appointed *the Cup to be received in this Holy Sacrament, to teſtifie that full remiſſion which his Blood has purchaſed for us.* The Church of *Rome* therefore in refuſing the Cup to the People, not only violates the expreſs Command of our Bleſſed Saviour; but according to Monſieur *de Meaux*'s Principles, teaches them by it, that a full remiſſion of Sins is not yet obtain'd, even by the precious Blood of Chriſt himſelf.

It may by this appear what little advantage Monſieur *de Meaux* can get to juſtify their Doctrine of the corporeal Preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, from the *Analogie* of the *ancient Sacrifices*, which do clearly and neceſſarily eſtabliſh the contrary. For what remains of this Diſcourſe we are but little concerned in it.

We confeſs this Sacrament to be ſomewhat more than a *meer Figure*; but we deny that therefore it muſt be his *very Body*. We acknowledge *the power of God, to do whatever he pleaſes*: Yet Monſieur *de Meaux* may pleaſe to conſider, that *Contradictions*, ſuch as to be, and not to be at the ſame time, are even in their own Schools uſually excepted.

cepted. Monſieur *de Meaux* ſuppoſes, that becauſe Chriſt did not explain his words in the *figurative Senſe*, the Apoſtles muſt needs have underſtood them in the *Literal*. But we have before ſhewed, that *the Jews*, who are certainly the beſt Judges, are of a quite contrary opinion, *viz.* That his Apoſtles knowing his alluſion as they did, could never have underſtood them otherwiſe than in a Figure. In a word, for his laſt Remark, "*That the Laws of diſ-*"*courſe, which permit, that where there is a juſt Proportion*"*between the Sign and the thing ſignified, the one may be put*"*for the other; Yet ſuffer it not to be ſo, when a Morſel of*"*Bread, for inſtance, is ſet to repreſent the Body of a Man:* We muſt beg leave to ſay, that neither is the Proportion ſo ſmall betwixt *the Bread broken* and *Chriſt's Body broken*, as Monſieur *de Meaux* would ſuggeſt; Or, that if there were, yet ſince our Saviour's inſtitution has ſet the one to repreſent to us the other; we think that deſignation ought to be of more Authority with us, than all their new Laws of Diſcourſe; invented purpoſely only to ſet the fairer Gloſs upon ſo great and apparent an Error.

ARTICLE XVI.

Do this in Remembrance of Me.

THE Explication of the preceding Article, having engaged us to a length extraordinary, we will endeavour to recompence it by our ſhortneſs in this.

We are entirely agreed, that the Intention of the Son of God was to oblige us by theſe words to commemorate that Death which he underwent for our Salvation. We confeſs, that that real Preſence which we ſuppoſe in the Communion, do's not at all contradict the Nature of this Commemoration. We are perſuaded, that as the *Jews* eating of their *Peace-Offering*, which was the remembrance of

of God's Covenant, and particularly of the *Paſſover*, the Type of that *Paſchal Lamb that was offered for them in* Egypt, called to mind the *Sacrifice of* Iſaac, and that great *Deliverance* God had wrought for them, in bringing them up out of the Land of Bondage: So whilſt we eat of thoſe Holy Elements which our Saviour Chriſt has inſtituted, like the *Peace-Offering* among the *Jews*, to perpetuate the Memory of his Death, We call to mind the more lively that great Deliverance which He has wrought for us, and render Thanks for it, and by Faith and Repentance apply to our ſelves the Merits of it.

Thus whilſt we receive theſe Holy Signs which he has inſtituted for our Memorial, we need no real Deſcent of the Son of God from Heaven; no new Crucifying of the Lord of Glory to raiſe in our Souls thoſe juſt reſentments we ought to have of ſo excellent a Bleſſing. But as a Child cannot but recollect the Kindneſs and Affection of a dear Father, as often as he beholds the Monument where his dead Body lies interred: So we much more, cannot chuſe but excite our Love to our bleſſed Redeemer, as often as we ſee before our Eyes theſe *Sacred Elements* under which he is vailed. Nor is it neceſſary for this, that this *Myſtick Tomb*, as Monſieur *de Meaux* phraſes it, ſhould any more be changed into the *very real Body* of our Saviour to raiſe this remembrance, than that natural One into the dead Corps of the Father, to recall the tender Affections of his Child at the ſight of it.

In a word; As we will not now move any Argument from the nature of this *remembrance*, to oppoſe that *ſubſtantial change*, which we have before combated on more ſolid grounds; ſo we ſuppoſe much leſs ought Monſieur *de Meaux* from the ſole opinion of that more *lively remembrance*, which he imagines the actual eating of the very Fleſh of Chriſt would raiſe in us, than only to do it in a Figure, to conclude him to be ſubſtantially there: It being

ing evident, that they who believe this change, and they who believe it not, receive him entirely alike. They ſee, and taſte, and feel the ſame thing: It is *Faith* alone which works in both, and makes the one believing him *ſpiritually* preſent, to remember him with the ſame Love, to honour him with the ſame Reverence, and embrace him with the ſame Hope, as the other, who thinks him *corporeally*, but yet after a manner altogether unperceivable, contain'd under the ſacred Elements that are preſented to him.

ARTICLE XVII.

The Doctrine of the Church of England, *concerning this Holy Sacrament.*

THE ſum of our belief as to the nature of this Holy Sacrament, is this:

We eſteem it deſigned by Chriſt to be a perpetual Memorial of his Suffering for us: "*That ſo as often as we eat*
1 Cor. 11. 26. "*of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, we might ſhew forth*
"*the Lord's Death till his coming.*

We believe that in this Communion, we do not only remember, but effectually partake of our Bleſſed Saviour, and all the benefits of his Paſſion; Inſomuch that to "*ſuch*
See our 28 Article. "*as rightly, and worthily, and with Faith receive the ſame,*
"*the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Chriſt,*
"*and likewiſe the Cup of the Bleſſing, is a partaking of the*
"*Blood of Chriſt.*

See the ſame Article. For the manner of this Participation, "*We believe that*
"*the Body and Blood of Chriſt, are given, taken, and eaten in*
"*this Supper, only after a heavenly and ſpiritual manner;*
"*and that the means whereby this is done, is Faith.*

The ſame Article. "*We believe that the wicked and ſuch as are void of Faith,*
"*tho they may viſibly and carnally preſs with their Teeth, as*
"*St.*

" *St.* Auguſtine *ſaith, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood*
" *of Chriſt, yet are no way partakers of Chriſt, but rather, as*
" *St.* Paul *tells us, eat and drink their own Damnation, not* 1 Cor. 11.
" *diſcerning the Lord's Body.*

In a word, " *We believe that Tranſubſtantiation, or the* The ſame Ar-
" *change of the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine into the ſubſtance* ticle.
" *of Chriſt's Body and Blood, can never be proved by Holy*
" *Scripture, but is repugnant thereunto; contrary to the in-*
" *tention of our Bleſſed Saviour, and to the nature of this*
" *Holy Sacrament; and has given cauſe to many great abuſes,*
as in the following Article, we ſhall have occaſion more particularly to ſhew.

This is our Faith of this Holy Euchariſt: And in this Faith we are confirmed not only by thoſe unanſwerable Proofs which our Writers have given, and ſome of which we have before touch'd upon; but alſo from thoſe irreconcilable Differences which this Error has thrown the Writers of the Church of *Rome* into. In effect we find every Party expoſing the falſeneſs and impoſſibility of every ones *Hypotheſis* but his own. Their greateſt Men confeſs the uncertainty of their own Proofs. " *That there* " *is not in Scripture any formal proof of Tranſubſtantiati-* " *on.* So ‖ *Lombard*, * *Scotus*, and many others, " *That there* " *is not any, that without the Declaration of the Church* " *would be able to evince it.* † So Cardinal *Bellarmine* him-ſelf confeſſes; " *That had not the Church declared her ſelf* " *for the proper ſenſe of the words, the other might with as* " *good warrant have been received.* So ſays * Cardinal *Ca-* " *jetan*; " *That if the words of Conſecration refer to the* " *Bread, which is changed by them, then they muſt be taken in* " *our ſenſe.* So the generality of that Communion con-feſſe. In a word, ‖ " *That this Doctrine was no matter of* " *Faith till the Council of* Lateran, 1200 *Years after Chriſt;* " *and that had not that and the Council of* Trent *ſince in-* " *terpoſed, it would not have been ſo to this very day.*

‖ Lomb. 4. ſent. diſt. 11.
* Scotus 4. diſt. 11. q. 3.
† Bellarm. de *Euchar.* l. 3. c. 23. ſſ. ſecundo dicit. *Where he cites others of the ſame Opinion.*
* In 3. D. Th. q. 75. art. 1.
‖ See *Scotus* cited by *Bellarm.* l. 3. de Euch. c. 23. ſſ. Unum tamen. *So alſo* Gabriel *cited by* Suarez, T. 3. diſp. 50. ſect. 1. So *Lombard.* l. 4. ſent. diſt. 11. lit. *A.*

And here who can chuſe but admire the Power of Truth? That after ſo many outcries againſt us, for Oppoſing a Doctrine which they would make the World believe is as clear as if it were written with a Ray of the Sun; after ſo many *Anathema*'s againſt us for Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, and ten thouſand repetitions of their great *Scriptum eſt*, *This is my Body*: they ſhould at laſt be forced to confeſs, "*That they are not, cannot, nor are ever* "*like to be agreed in the Explication of them. That they* "*contain nothing in them neceſſary to prove this change,* "*That had not the Church declared it ſelf for the literal* "*Meaning; the figurative Interpretation might with as good* "*reaſon have been received. That for* 1200 *Years this Do-* "*ctrine was no matter of Faith, and but for the Council of* "Lateran *had nor been then.* In ſhort, *that if the words* "*of Inſtitution refer to the Bread, then are we doubtleſs in* "*the right.* And if they do not, how will they ever prove the change which they pretend is made of the *Bread* into the *Body of Chriſt* by them?

Certainly, Confeſſions, ſuch as theſe, ought to awake every Papiſt careful of his own Salvation, into an unprejudiced Examination at leaſt of theſe things; To conſider what Foundation there really is for this Doctrine, and what deſperate Conſequences, unknown to Antiquity, contrary to the formal words of Holy Scripture; and without God's infinite Mercy, abſolutely deſtructive of their eternal Salvation, have been built upon it.

As we hope that theſe Declarations have been permitted by God to fall from the greateſt and moſt eſteemed of their Church, not only to confirm us in our Faith, but alſo to prepare the way for their return to that *Catholick Truth* from which they have ſo long erred; ſo we doubt not, by God's Bleſſing, but that they will in time attain to it; when being ſenſible of that tyrannical Uſurpation that has been made over their Conſciences, and reſolved

to

to uſe that Knowledg God has given them, to ſearch the Scriptures, and examine their Faith, and not ſervily follow every Guide that will but pretend to lead them; They ſhall ſeriouſly and indifferently weigh all theſe things, and find that therefore only they have thought us in Darkneſs, becauſe their own Eyes were ſhut that they might not diſcern the Light.

ARTICLE XVIII.

Of Tranſubſtantiation, and of the Adoration of the Hoſt.

WHat remains of this Subject of the Holy Euchariſt, being wholly conſequent upon the foregoing miſtaken interpretation of the Words of our Bleſſed Saviour before conſidered; we ſhould have paſſed them over as things we have in effect already declared, that the Church of *England* receives not; but that we are perſwaded the particular conſideration of them will yet more fully ſhew the falſeneſs of that Foundation upon which they are built.

Monſieur *de Meaux*, in proving the Corporeal Preſence of Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt, from the words of Inſtitution, "*This is my Body*, had ſomething that at leaſt ſeemed to favour his Miſtake; but to produce them here for *Tranſubſtantiation*, that is, not only to argue the *Preſence of Chriſt's Subſtance*, but alſo *the change of the Subſtance of the Bread and Wine into it*, he has not the leaſt appearance of the Text for him.

Indeed, were there no other way for Chriſt to be preſent in the Euchariſt, but only by this change; it might then be allowed that having, as he imagines, proved the one, he had in effect eſtabliſhed the other. But the num-

ber of thoſe who interpret the Words in like manner according to the Letter, yet are as great Enemies as our ſelves to this change; and ſuppoſe Chriſt's Body to be preſent by a *Union of it to the Bread*, rather than by a *Converſion of the Bread into it*; not only ſhews that there is no neceſſary conſequence at all between the *real Preſence*, and *Tranſubſtantiation*, but that there is another manner of Chriſt's Preſence, both more agreeable to Holy Scripture, than that which they advance; and that takes off infinite Difficulties, which their *Tranſubſtantiation* involves them in.

That the Subſtance of the Sacred Figures remains in this Sacrament after the *Conſecration*, thoſe clear Expreſſions of St. *Paul*, wherein he ſo often calls them * *Bread* and *Wine* after it, ſeem to us plainly to ſhew: † *To break Bread*, the Holy Scripture tells us was the uſual Phraſe all the time of the Apoſtles, for *receiving the Holy Communion*; and which the Bleſſed Spirit himſelf dictated. Theſe Paſſages Monſieur *de Meaux* certainly ought not to put off with a figurative meaning, unleſs he can give us ſome good Reaſon why he follows *the High road* of the literal Interpretation in the one, to eſtabliſh the Subſtance of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament; and forſakes it in the other, to take away the Preſence of the Bread from it.

* 1 Cor. 10. 16, &c. —— 11. 26.
† Acts 2. 46, &c.

For the *Adoration of the Hoſt*, The Church of *England*, conſequently to her Principles of the Bread and Wine's remaining in their natural Subſtances, profeſſes that ſhe thinks it "*to be Idolatry, and to be abhorred of all faithful* "*Chriſtians.*

See her Rubrick at the end of the Communion-Office.

Monſieur *de Meaux*, in conformity to theirs, tells us; "*That the preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, ought* "*to carry all ſuch as believe it without all ſcruple to the A-* "*doration of it.* This therefore being taken as a Principle acknowledged by them; it may not be amiſs to obſerve,

ſerve, that ſince it is certain, that neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles appointed or practiſed, nor the Church for above 1000 Years required or taught *any Adoration of this Holy Sacrament*; neither could they, according to Monſieur *de Meaux*'s Principles, have believed the *Corporeal Preſence* of our Bleſſed Saviour in it.

Is there any of the Evangeliſts that mention it? They all tell us, *Take, Eat*; *Do this in remembrance of me.* But does any one add, *This is my Body, fall down and worſhip it?*

When St. *Paul* reproved the *Corinthians* for violating this Holy Sacrament; is it poſſible he could have omitted ſo obvious a Remark, and ſo much to his purpoſe; That in profaning this Holy Sacrament, they were not only guilty of the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, which it was inſtituted to repreſent to us; but even directly affronted their Bleſſed Maſter corporally preſent there; and whom inſtead of profaning, they ought, as they had been taught, *to Adore in it?* 1 Cor. 11. 20, &c.

With what ſimplicity do the Ancient Fathers ſpeak of this Communion in all their Writings? *The Elevation* of the Sacred Symbols was not heard of till the Seventh Century; and then uſed only to repreſent the lifting up of Chriſt upon the Croſs, not to expoſe it to the People to adore it. *The Bell, the Feaſt of the St. Sacrament, the Pomp of carrying it through the Streets,* all the other Circumſtances of this Worſhip, are inventions of yeſterday. The expoſing of it upon the Altar to make their Prayers before it; their Addreſſes to it in times and caſes of neceſſity; their performing the chiefeſt Acts of Religion in its preſence, never mentioned in Antiquity.

Nay, inſtead of this Worſhip, they did many things utterly inconſiſtent with it. They diſputed with the Heathens for *worſhipping Gods their own Hands had made.* Was it ever objected to them, that they themſelves did the

the ſame? Worſhip a Deity whoſe ſubſtance they firſt formed, and then ſpoke it into a God? They *burnt* in ſome Churches *what remained of the Holy Sacrament. They permitted the People to carry it home,* that had communicated: *They ſent it abroad* by Sea, by Land, without any the leaſt regard, that we can find, had to its *Worſhip: They buried it* with their Dead; they made *Plaiſters* of the *Bread*; they mix'd *the Wine* with their *Ink.* Theſe certainly were no inſtances of *Adoration:* Nor can we poſſibly ſuppoſe that they who did ſuch things as theſe, ever believed that it was the very *Body* and *Blood* of their dear Maſter, whom they ſo much loved; and whom doubtleſs they would have been as ready to have worſhipped, had they ſo believed; as both Monſieur *de Meaux* ſuppoſes they ought to have been, and as we ſee others, for the reſt no more pious than thoſe Primitive Chriſtians were, now to do it.

ARTICLE XIX.

Of the Sacrifice of the Maſs.

A Third Conſequence of the *Corporeal Preſence* of Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt, is the *Sacrifice of the Maſs:* In which we ought to proceed with all the Caution ſuch a Point requires, as both makes up the chiefeſt part of the Popiſh Worſhip, and is juſtly eſteem'd one of the greateſt and moſt dangerous Errors that offends us.

Monſieur *de Meaux* has repreſented it to us with ſo much tenderneſs, that except perhaps it be his Foundation of the *Corporeal Preſence* on which he builds, and his Conſequence that this Service is *a true and real Propitiatory Sacrifice,* which his manner of expounding it we are perſwaded will never bear; there is little in it beſides but what we could readily aſſent to.

We

We diſtinguiſh the two Acts, which he mentions, from one another. By the *Conſecration* we apply the *Elements*, before common, to a Sacred Uſe; by the *Manducation*, we fulfil our Saviour's Command; "We *take*, "and *eat*, and *do this in remembrance of Him*.

This *Conſecration* being ſeparately made of his *Body broken*, his *Blood ſpilt* for our Redemption, we ſuppoſe repreſents to us our Bleſſed Lord in the figure of his Death, which theſe holy Symbols were inſtituted to continue the Memory of. And whilſt thus with Faith we repreſent to God the Death of his Son, for the pardon of our Sins; we are perſwaded, that we incline his Mercy the more readily to forgive them.

We do not therefore doubt, but that this preſenting to God Almighty the *Sacrifice* of our Bleſſed Lord, is a moſt effectual manner of applying his *Merits* to us. Were this all the Church of *Rome* meant by her *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, there is not certainly any Proteſtant that would oppoſe her in it.

Where is that Chriſtian, that does not by *Faith unite himſelf to his Saviour* in this holy Communion? That does not preſent him to God as his *only Sacrifice* and *Propitiation*? That does not proteſt that he has nothing to offer him but *Jeſus Chriſt*, and the *Merits of his Death*? That conſecrates not all his Prayers by this Divine Offering? and whilſt he thus preſents to God the Sacrifice of his Son, does not learn thereby to preſent alſo himſelf a lively Sacrifice, holy, and acceptable in his ſight?

This is, no doubt, a *Sacrifice* worthy a Chriſtian, infinitely exceeding all the Sacrifices of the Law. Where the Knife is the Word, the *Blood ſhed not but in a figure, nor is there any Death but in Repreſentation.* A Sacrifice ſo far from taking us off from that of the Croſs, that it unites us the more cloſely to it; repreſents it to us, and derives all its Virtue and Efficacy from it.

This

This is, if any other, truly *the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*, and ſuch as the *Church of England* has never refuſed: and except it be our doubt of the *Corporeal Preſence*, Monſieur *de Meaux* had certainly reaſon to expect, that there was nothing in this we could juſtly except againſt.

But now, that all this is ſufficient to prove the *Maſs* to be a "*True and proper Sacrifice, truly and properly propitiatory for the Sins and Puniſhments, the Satisfactions and Neceſſities of the Dead and Living; and that to offer this true and proper Sacrifice, our Saviour Chriſt inſtituted a true and proper Prieſthood, when he ſaid, Do this in Remembrance of Me:* This is what we cannot yet underſtand, & what we think we ought not ever to allow of.

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 22.

We know indeed, that the Primitive Church, called the holy *Euchariſt* a *Sacrifice*, in that large extent of the Expreſſion, whereby the holy Scripture ſtiles every Religious Performance, our *Prayers*, our *Thankſgivings*, our *Vertues*, our *very Selves*, *Sacrifices* to God: And accordingly in our own *Liturgy*, we do, without all ſcruple, do the ſame. But when it comes to be ſet in oppoſition to a Sacrament, and to be conſidered in the true and proper ſignification of the Word; we muſt, with all Antiquity, needs profeſs, That we neither have, nor can we after that of Chriſt admit of any.

Hence it is, that our Church following the Doctrine of the Holy Apoſtles and Primitive Chriſtians, teaches; "*That the Offering of Chriſt once made, is that proper Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for all the Sins of the whole World; and that there is no other Satisfaction for Sin but that alone.*

See Article 31.

That the *Application* of Chriſt's Death by *Faith* in the Holy Euchariſt, is made to all ſuch as with true Repentance receive the ſame, we undoubtedly believe. We are perſwaded, that by our Prayers, which in this Holy Solemnity we never fail to offer

offer for the Wants and Neceſſities, the Pardon and Forgiveneſs, not of our ſelves only, but of all Mankind; of thoſe who have not yet known the Faith of Chriſt; or, that knowing it, have prevaricated from the right way, we incline God's Mercy to become *propitious* unto them. Only we deny, that by this Holy Euchariſt, as by a *true* and *proper Propitiatory Sacrifice*, we can appeaſe God's Wrath for the ſins of the whole World; can fulfil the ſatisfactions, and ſupply the neceſſities of other men; of the *dead* and the *living*; of them that are abſent, and partake not of it. This we attribute to the Sacrifice of the Croſs only; and are perſwaded that it cannot, without derogation to the Merits of that moſt abſolute Redemption which was there purchaſed for us, be applied to any other.

When we examine the firſt *Inſtitution* of this holy Communion, we cannot perceive either in the words or action of our Bleſſed Saviour, any *Sacrifical Act* or *Expreſſion*. "*He took bread, and brake it, and gave* "*it to his Diſciples, ſaying, Take, Eat, This is my Bo-* "*dy which is given for you: Do this in Remembrance* "*of Me.*

Monſieur *de Meaux* ſeems to imply, that the *Conſecration* made it a Sacrifice. But this *Vaſquez* tells us, that others think to be only a *preparation to it*, becauſe till after the *Conſecration* Chriſt is not there, and by Conſequence cannot be *offered*. *In* 3. *D. Th. diſp.* 222. *c.* 1.

The Council of *Trent* ſeems to refer it to the *Oblation*: This *Bellarmine* oppoſes, becauſe neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles uſed any. *L.* 1. *de Miſſ. c.* 27.

Bellarmine is poſitive, that either Chriſt ſacrificed *in Conſecrating & Eating*, or there is no other Action in which he can be ſaid to have done it. Yet even *Ibid.*

this the greateſt part of that Communion reject; becauſe *Eating* is not *Offering:* and in the Ordination where the Prieſt receives the power of *Sacrificing*, not any mention is made of it. In Effect, Reaſon will tell us, That this is to *partake of the Offering*, not *to offer it*; and Monſieur *de Meaux* himſelf accordingly diſtinguiſhes the Two Acts of *Conſecration* and *Manducation* from one another, and refers the Sacrifice wholly to the former.

If we conſider the Nature of *a true and proper Sacrifice*, they univerſally agree, that theſe Four Things are neceſſarily required to it. 1. That what is Offered be ſomething that is *Viſible*. 2. That *of prophane*, which it was before, it be now made *ſacred*. 3. That it be *offered to God*. And, 4. by that *offering* ſuffer an *eſſential deſtruction*.

Now we ſuppoſe, that the greateſt part of theſe Conditions are evidently wanting to this pretended Sacrifice of Chriſt's Body in the *Maſs*. 1. It is *Inviſible:* They confeſs it. 2. It was never *prophane*, that it ſhould be made *ſacred:* They will not preſume to ſay that it was. 3. It ſuffers no *eſſential deſtruction*; "*The Blood is not ſpilt but in a Myſtery*, ſays Mon- "ſieur *de Meaux*, *nor is there any Death but in Repre-* "*ſentation*.

As therefore none of theſe things *truly* and *properly* agree to this holy Euchariſt; ſo we ſuppoſe, that neither can it be *truly* and *properly a Sacrifice*. We are perſwaded, that the *Offering* it ſelf, like the *neceſſary* and *eſſential Properties* of it, muſt be only in *Figure* and *Repreſentation*. This is what we willingly allow Monſieur *de Meaux*, and what their own Principles do undoubtedly prove.

For what our Saviour adds, "*Do this in Remem-* "*brance*

"*brance of Me.* However the Council of *Trent* has Canonically reſolved it to be the Inſtitution of a true and proper *Prieſthood*, to offer this Sacrifice; yet that it has no ſuch Proof, the preceding Diſcourſe evidently ſhews. Our Saviour Chriſt commanding his Apoſtles to *Do this*, commanded them to *Do* no more than what himſelf had done: So that if he therefore did not *Sacrifice* himſelf, neither did he give any Authority to them, or to their Succeſſors to *Sacrifice*.

See *Seſſ.* 22. *cap.* 1.

ARTICLE XX.

Of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

THE Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* ſo clearly eſtabliſhes our Doctrine, in oppoſition to the pretended Sacrifice of *the Maſs*, that Monſieur *de Meaux* had certainly reaſon to enter on a particular conſideration of it. We will, after his Example, follow the ſame Method, and ſhew the whole Deſign of that Sacred Book to be directly contrary to the Principles of the *Roman* Church.

Monſieur *de Meaux* obſerves, that the Author of this Epiſtle concludes, that there ought not only *no other Victim to be offered for Sin after that of Chriſt, but that even Chriſt himſelf ought not to be any more offered.* Now, the Reaſon which the Apoſtle gives, is this; Becauſe that otherwiſe, ſays he, *Chriſt muſt often have ſuffered:* Plainly implying, that there can be no *true Offering* without *Suffering*. So that in the *Maſs* then, either Chriſt muſt *Suffer*, which Monſieur *de Meaux* denies, or he is not *Offered*, which we affirm.

Heb. 9. 25, 26.

This is ſo evidently the meaning of that place, and
Heb. 9. 22. ſo often repeated, "*That without Blood, there is no* "*Remiſſion*; that Monſieur *de Meaux* is forced freely to declare, that if we take the word *Offer* as it is uſed in that Epiſtle, they muſt profeſs to the whole World, that Chriſt is no more *Offered*, either in the Maſs, or any other way. Now, how theſe things can ſtand together, that the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* contradicts not the Offering of the Maſs, and yet that the ſame Epiſtle abſolutely declares, that Chriſt can no more be *Offered*, becauſe he can no more *Suffer*; nor any more become *a Propitiatory Sacrifice*, becauſe *without Blood there is no Propitiation*: All which Monſieur *de Meaux* allows, and profeſſes to the whole World, that in the Notion of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, *Chriſt is not offered* in the Maſs, nor can be any where elſe, we are not very well able to comprehend.

But that Epiſtle goes yet further. It tells us, that
Heb. 10. 14. Chriſt ought to be but once offered; becauſe "*by that* "*one Offering he has fully ſatisfied for our Sins*, and "*has perfected for ever them that are Sanctified.* If therefore by that *firſt Offering* he hath fully ſatisfied
Ibid. v. 18. for our Sins, there is then "*no more need of any Offer-* "*ing for Sin*: If by that *firſt Sacrifice he hath per-* "*fected for ever them that are ſanctified*, the Maſs certainly muſt be altogether needleſs to make any addi-
Ibid. v. 2. tion to that which is already perfect. In a word, if the Sacrifices of the Law were therefore repeated, as this Epiſtle tells us, becauſe they were *imperfect*; and had they been otherwiſe, they ſhould have ceaſed to have been offered. What can we conclude, but the Church of *Rome* then, in every Maſs ſhe offers, does violence to the *Croſs of Chriſt*; and in more than one ſenſe, *Crucifies to her ſelf the Lord of Glory.*

Laſtly;

Laſtly; The Council of *Trent* declares, that becauſe there is a new and proper *Sacrifice* to be offered, it was neceſſary that our Saviour Chriſt ſhould inſtitute a new and proper *Prieſthood* to offer it. And ſo they ſay he did, after the *Order of Melchiſedeck*, in oppoſition to that after the *Order of Aaron* under the Law. Now certainly nothing can be more contrary to this Epiſtle than ſuch an Aſſertion: Both whoſe deſcription of this Prieſthood ſhews it can agree only to our Bleſſed Lord; and which indeed in expreſs terms declares it to be peculiar to him. It calls it *an unchangeable Prieſthood*, that paſſes not to any other, as that of *Aaron* did from Father to Son, but continues in him only, becauſe that he alſo himſelf continues for evermore. Heb. 7. 3. *Ibid.* v. 27.

ARTICLE XXI.

Reflections on the foregoing Doctrine.

AND here then let us conjure our Brethren of the Church of *Rome* ſeriouſly to conſider theſe things; and into what deſperate Conſequences that great Error of the *Corporeal Preſence* has inſenſibly led them.

Can any thing be more raſh or more uncharitable, even the Literal Interpretation of this Holy Euchariſt being allow'd, than their *Canon of Tranſubſtantiation?* To cut off from their Communion the greateſt and moſt Orthodox part of the Chriſtian Church, only for a Nicety; *a manner of Preſence*, which neither has the Scripture any where revealed, and which they themſelves never underſtood.

Is.

Is it poſſible for Men to fall into a groſſer or more dangerous Error, than to ſet up a *Wafer* for their *God*, and pay a divine Worſhip *to a morſel of Bread?* Shall their good Intentions ſecure them? Had not
Exod. 32. 5. the *Iſraelites* a good Intention to "*hold a Feaſt unto the Lord*, when they worſhipped the Molten Calf? Were they therefore not *Idolaters* for it? Had this been a ſufficient Excuſe, *Nadab* and *Abihu* had not been puniſhed: Their Intention was certainly good,
Lev. 10. *to burn Incenſe to the Lord.* The Jews had a good intention even in *crucifying the Lord of Glory:* St. *Paul* thought it Zeal to perſecute his Diſciples. Our Bleſſed Saviour has foretold, and we live to ſee it accompliſhed, that the time ſhould come when Men ſhould *kill their Brethren, and think they did God*
Joh. 16. 2. *good ſervice.* The Church of *Rome* may do well to conſider whether their good Intention will juſtify them that do it; and whether both in this, and that, they do not run a deſperate hazard, if it appear that they have no other Plea than a well-meant miſtake to excuſe them.

For our parts, we muſt needs profeſs that theſe Things give us not only a Scandal, but a Horror for their Religion. Monſieur *de Meaux* had certainly reaſon to ſay, that this is the *chiefeſt* and *moſt important* of all our Controverſies, and wherein we are at the fartheſt diſtance from one another. And would to God they had only offended us by theſe Errors; and had not expoſed our common Name to the reproach of the very Heathen; who have been confirmed by them in their *Idolatry*, and thought it more rational to adore a Stock or a Stone, than with the Chriſtians to Worſhip this moment what they Eat the very next.

But

But monſieur *de Meaux* thinks we have no reaſon to appear ſo obſtinate againſt them, who declare our ſelves ſo favourably towards the *Lutherans*, who yet are involved in the ſame Error. 'Tis true we believe the *Lutherans* miſtaken in their Literal interpretation of this Holy Sacrament. But we are perſwaded they are infinitely leſs ſo, and leſs dangerouſly than the Papiſts.

They confeſs that there is no change made in the *Subſtanee of the Sacred Elements*. They believe that the *Bread* and *Wine* continue in their proper Natures, and that Chriſt's Body is preſent only when he is received. They *adore not the Holy Euchariſt*: They *found no Propitiatory Sacrifices upon it*: They *ſay no Maſſes for the ſins and ſatisfactions, for the wants and neceſſities of the Dead and the Living*: They *deny not the Cup to the People*; their Errour in one word, whatſoever it be, is only a matter of ſimple belief; has no ill conſequences attending it, nor do they damn us for not receiving it.

Let the Church of *Rome* do all this: Let them raze their *Anathema*'s out of their *Councils*, and *baniſh* their *Maſſes* and *Adorations* out of their *Churches*; Let them no longer ſcandalize us with any unwarrantable practices, nor deſire to enſlave our Conſciences by ſubmitting them to their own inventions; and though we ſhall ſtill think *Tranſubſtantiation* to be the greater Error, yet will we receive them with the ſame charity we do the *Lutherans*: We will pray to God to give them a better underſtanding, but will not drive them from our Communion, for matters of ſimple belief, and which are only to themſelves, tho they be wrong.

But

But till then, in vain do's Monſieur *de Meaux* exhort us to conſider the ways of providence to bring us to a Union which God knows we could be glad to have on any terms but the loſs of Truth. In the mean time if the Church of *Rome* in good earneſt thinks, that as we tolerate the foundation of all theſe Errours, *the Corporeal preſence*, in the *Lutherans*, ſo we ought to bear the conſequences of it in them: Let them at leaſt do what the *Lutherans* have done; let them embrace our Communion; let them leave off to perſecute us where they have power, and to damn us where they have not; let them receive us as Brethren, not lord it over us as our Maſters. This will make us hope that they are ſincere when they conjure us to be at peace with them; and they may juſtly then accuſe us of partiality, if we continue to repute them as Enemies, when they will be thus content to love, and receive, and deal with us as Friends.

ARTICLE. XXII.

Of Communicating only under one kind.

THis is the laſt of thoſe *Conſequences* that give us a juſt deteſtation for that great Errour *of the Corporeal preſence* on which they are founded. It is ſo plainly contrary to the expreſs Command of our Bleſſed Saviour, that we are perſwaded it has pleaſed God to ſuffer them to fall into it, on purpoſe to correct that vanity whereby they have ſo proudly aſpired to an Opinion of *Infallibility*. That whilſt they lord it over Mens Conſciences, and will not ſo much as

as give them leave to ask them a Reaſon of what they do, they might here at laſt be ſurpriſed in an Error which the moſt vulgar Eye is able to diſcern.

The Church of England, conformable to all Antiquity, declares, "*That the Cup ought not to be deny'd to the* "*Lay-people*; *foraſmuch as both parts of the Lord's Sa-* "*crament by Chriſt's Ordinance and Commandment*, "*ought to be miniſtred to all Chriſtian Men alike.* See our 30th Article.

For indeed, Did not he who ſaid of the *Bread*, "*Take, Eat, this is my Body*, ſay alſo of the *Wine*, with the ſame expreſſneſs, "*Drink ye all of this, for this is* "*my Blood of the New Teſtament which is ſhed for you* "*for the remiſſion of Sins?*

Did not he who commanded them, "*Do this in re-* "*membrance of Me*, for the *Bread*, even according to their own Conſtruction, Take and Conſecrate, and give to Others, as I have done to you; command them for *the Cup* in like manner, "*Do this, i. e.* conſecrate, and give it to Others, as I have done to you, *in remembrance of Me?*

We confeſs, That *the Grace of God is not tied to the outward Signs*: Yet we think withal, that without taking the outward and viſible Signs, we can have no pretence to the inward and ſpiritual Grace of that Holy Sacrament; which deriving all its Effect from our Saviour's *Promiſe*, we can have no ſecurity that it ſhall have any good one to them, who do not receive it according to his *Inſtitution*.

Had Chriſt eſteemed it ſufficient for us to receive *the Blood in the Body*, we ſuppoſe he would not have conſecrated *the Cup afterwards*. But if it was our Saviour's pleaſure, that to commemorate the more lively his Paſſion, we ſhould take his *Blood* as it was ſpilt for our Redemption, ſeparate from his *Body*; we think

it an unwarrantable presumption for us to make our selves wiser than God, and say, that it is sufficient to participate of Both in One.

Monsieur *de Meaux* has received so full an Answer upon this point, from the Reply made to his Treatise written purposely on this Subject, that he will have no cause to complain of us for not repeating here, what has been so fully and so successfully handled there.

Only as to that Negligence of these latter Ages, which he is pleased to alledge as the reason of this change; We must needs say, that God be thanked, we cannot observe any such Negligence of this holy Communion in our Churches, where yet this holy Sacrament is administred to as large Congregations, and with as great frequency as any where among Them. Both our Priests and the People, give and receive it with that Care and Reverence, that we find as little grounds for any such pretence, as there is reason in it, were it never so true, to justfie so great and unwarrantable a Change.

PART

PART III.

OF THE

CHURCH.

ARTICLE XXIII.

Of the Word Written and Unwritten.

OUR Bleſſed Saviour having founded his Church upon the Word which He preached, we confeſs, that the *unwritten Word*, as to that Goſpel which he preached, was *the firſt Rule* of Chriſtians. But God Almighty foreſeeing how liable ſuch a Rule muſt have been to infinite Inconveniencies, thought fit to have that *Word* which was firſt ſpoken by *Mouth*, afterwards conſigned to *Writing*. By which means the *Word written* and *unwritten* were not Two different *Rules*, but as to all neceſſary Matters of Faith, one and the ſame: And the *unwritten Word* ſo far from *loſing its Authority*, that it was indeed the more firmly Eſtabliſh'd, by being thus delivered to us by the Holy Apoſtles and Evangeliſts.

We receive with the ſame Veneration whatſoever comes from the Apoſtles, whether by *Scripture* or *Tradition*, provided that we can be aſſured that it comes from them. And if it can be made appear, that any *Tradition* which the *Written Word* contains not, has been received by *All Churches*, and in *All Ages*, we are ready to embrace it, as coming from the Apoſtles.

Monſieur *de Meaux* therefore ought not to charge us as Enemies to *Tradition*, or obſtinate not to receive what is ſo delivered. Our Church rejects not *Tradition*, but only *thoſe things which they pretend to have received by it*: But which we ſuppoſe to be ſo far from being the Doctrine of the *Apoſtles*, or of *All Churches* in *All Ages*, that we are perſwaded they are many of them directly contrary to the *Written Word*, which is by Themſelves confeſſed to be the Apoſtles Doctrine, and which the beſt and pureſt Ages of the Church adhered to.

ARTICLE XXIV.

Of the Churches Authority.

THE Church, *i.e. The Univerſal Church in All Ages*, having been Eſtabliſh'd by God, the Guardian of the Holy Scriptures, and of Tradition, we receive from her the *Canonical Books of Scripture*. It is upon this Authority, that we receive principally the *Song of Solomon* as Canonical, and reject other Books as Apochryphal, which we might perhaps with as much readineſs otherwiſe receive. By this Authority

rity we reverence these Books, *even before by our own reading of them, we perceive the Spirit of God in them*: And when by our reading them, we find all things conformable to so Excellent a *Spirit*, we are yet more confirmed in the belief and reverence we before had of them.

This Authority therefore we freely allow the Church, that by her hands in the succession of the several Ages, we have received the Holy Scriptures. And if as *universal and uncontroverted a Tradition* had descended for the *Interpretation* of the Scriptures, as for the *receiving* of them, we should have been as ready to accept of that too. Such a declaration of the sense of Holy Scripture as had been received by *all Churches*, and in *all Ages*, the Church of *England* would never refuse: But then as we profess not to receive the Scriptures themselves *only*, or perhaps *principally* upon the *Authority of the Roman Church*, which has in all Ages made up but *a part*, and that not always *the greatest* neither, of this *Tradition*; so neither can we think it reasonable to receive the sense of them only from her, though she profess never so much, to invent nothing of her self, but only to declare the *Divine Revelation* made to her by the *Holy Ghost*, which she supposes has been given to her for her direction: Whilst we are perswaded, that neither has any Promise at all been made to any *particular Church* of such an infallible direction; and have such good cause to believe that this particular Church too often, instead of the Divine Revelation, declares only her own Inventions.

When the dispute arose about the *Ceremonies of the Law*, Acts 15. the Apostles assembled at *Jerusalem* for the determination of it. When any Doubts arise

riſe in the Church now, we always eſteem it the beſt Method to decide them after the ſame manner. That the Church has Authority, not only in Matters of *Order* and *Diſcipline*, but even of *Faith* too, we never deny'd: But that therefore any Church ſo aſſembled, can with the ſame Authority ſay now, as the Apoſtles did then, "*It has ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to* "*Us*: This we think not only an unwarrantable preſumption, for which there is not any ſufficient ground in Holy Scripture, but evidently in it ſelf untrue, ſeeing that many ſuch Councils are by the Papiſts themſelves confeſſed to have erred.

Acts 15. 28.

Hence it is that we cannot ſuppoſe it reaſonable to forbid Men the Examination of the *Churches Deciſions*, which *may err*, when the *Holy Apoſtles*, nay *our Saviour Chriſt* himſelf, not only permitted, but exhorted their Diſciples to ſearch the Truth of their Doctrine, which was certainly *Infallible*. Yet if the determination be matter of Order or Government, as *not to eat of things offered to Idols*, &c. or of plain and undoubted Precepts, as "*to abſtain from Fornication*, and the like; Here we fail not, after the Example of *Paul* and *Silas*, to declare to the Faithful what her Deciſion has been; and inſtead of permitting them to judg of what has been ſo reſolved, teach them throughout all places "*to keep the Ordinances of the Apoſtles*.

Acts 16. 4.

Thus is it that we acquieſce in the judgment of the Church; and profeſſing in our Creed a *Holy Catholick Church*, we profeſs to believe, not only that there was a Church planted by our Saviour at the beginning, that has hitherto been preſerved by him, and ever ſhall be to the end of the World; but do by conſequence undoubtedly believe too, that this *Univerſal Church* is ſo ſecured by the Promiſes of Chriſt, that there ſhall always

ways be retain'd ſo much Truth in it, the want of which would argue that there could be no ſuch Church. We do not fear that ever the *Catholick Church* ſhould fall into this *intire Infidelity*: But that any *particular Church*, ſuch as that of *Rome*, may not either by Error loſe, or by other means prevaricate the Faith, even in the *neceſſary Points* of it; this we ſuppoſe not to be at all contrary to the Promiſe of God Almighty, and we wiſh we had not too great cauſe to fear, that the Church of *Rome* has in effect done both.

It is not therefore of the *Catholick Church*, truly ſuch, that we either fear this *infidelity*, or complain that ſhe hath endeavoured to render her ſelf *Miſtreſs of our Faith*. But for that particular Communion, to which Monſieur *de Meaux* is pleaſed to give the Name, tho ſhe profeſſes never ſo much to ſubmit her ſelf to the *Holy Scripture*, and to follow the *Tradition* of the Fathers in *all Ages*; yet whilſt ſhe uſurps the abſolute Interpretation, both of Scripture and Fathers, and forbids us to examine whether ſhe does it rightly or no, we muſt needs complain that her Proteſtations are invalid, whilſt her Actions ſpeak the contrary: For that, if this be not to render her ſelf *Miſtreſs of our Faith*, we cannot conceive what is.

In a word, tho we ſuppoſe the Scriptures are ſo clearly written, that it can very hardly happen, that in the *neceſſary Articles of Faith* any one Man ſhould be found oppoſite to the whole Church in his Opinion: Yet if ſuch a one were *evidently convinced* that his Belief was founded upon the undoubted Authority of God's Holy Word, ſo far would it be from any *Horror* to ſupport it, that it is at this day the greateſt glory

glory of S. *Athanaſius*, that he ſtood up alone againſt *the whole World*, in defence of *Chriſt's Divinity*, when the *Pope*, the *Councils*, the *whole Church* fell away.

Conclude we therefore, that God, who has made us, and knows what is beſt and moſt proper for us, as he has ſubjected us to the Government and Direction of his *Church* for our *Peace* and *Welfare*; ſo to ſecure our *Faith*, he has given us his Holy Word, to be the *laſt reſort*, the *final*, *infallible Rule*, by which both we and the Church it ſelf muſt be directed: And from this therefore if any one ſhall endeavour to turn us aſide, or preach any other Goſpel unto us than what we have therein received, tho he were an *Apoſtle* from the Grave, or even an *Angel* from Heaven, let him be *Anathema*.

Gal. 1. 8, 9.

ARTICLE XXV.

The Opinion of the Church of England, *as to the Authority of the Church.*

FOR the two laſt Articles of Monſieur *de Meaux*'s Expoſition, I might very well have paſs'd them by. The Church of *England*, whoſe Doctrine I pretend to explain, is but very little concerned in them. Therefore only in a word, That we allow the Church a juſt *Authority* in Matters of *Faith*, both the Declaration of our *xxth Article*, and the Subſcription we make to the whole *xxxix* ſhew: Such a difference we allow to her Deciſions, that we make them our directions what Doctrine we may, or may not

not, publickly maintain and teach in her Communion: In effect, we ſhew whatever Submiſſion we can to her *Authority*, without violating *that of God*, declared to us in his *Holy Scriptures*.

Whatſoever deference we allow to a *National Church or Council*, the ſame we think in a much greater degree due to a *General*. And whenſoever ſuch a one, which we much deſire, ſhall be freely and lawfully aſſembled, to determine the Differences of the *Catholick Church*, none ſhall be more ready both to aſſiſt in it, and ſubmit to it.

ARTICLE XXVI.

Of the Authority of the Holy See, and of Epiſcopacy.

FOR the *Pope*'s *Authority*, tho we ſuppoſe no good Conſequence can be drawn from that Primacy we are content to allow St. *Peter* among *the Apoſtles*, for that exorbitant Power which has of late been pretended to: Yet when other Differences ſhall be agreed, and the true Bounds ſet to his Pretences, we ſhall be content to yield him whatſoever "*Autho-*"*rity the Ancient Councils of the Primitive Church have* "*acknowledged, and the Holy Fathers have always* "*taught the Faithful to give him.*

This Monſieur *de Meaux* ought to be contented with; who himſelf abſolves us from yielding to thoſe pretences, that have indeed very juſtly rendred this Authority, not only odious, but intolerable to the World.

Let thoſe who are *Enemies to Epiſcopacy*, and who deny *any due reſpect* to the *Chair of St. Peter*, anſwer

for themſelves. The *Church of England* has both retain'd the one, and will be ready according to what we have before declared, when ever it ſhall be requiſite, to acknowledg the other.

ARTICLE XXVII.

The CLOSE.

SUCH is the *Doctrine of the Church of England* in thoſe points which Monſieur *de Meaux* has thought fit to propoſe, as the principal matters in debate betwixt us. May it pleaſe the unprejudiced Papiſt to ſay, what he can find in All theſe, to warrant that bitter and unchriſtian hatred they have conceived againſt us. To cut us off, as much as in them lies, from the Communion of Chriſt's Church on Earth, and to deny us all part of his Promiſes in Heaven.

We firmly believe *the Holy Scriptures*, and whatſoever they teach or command, we receive and ſubmit to, as to the Word of God. We embrace all the *ancient Creeds*, and in them all that Faith which the Primitive Chriſtians ſuppoſed, and which the Religious Emperors, by their Advice, decreed ſhould be ſufficient to intitle us to the common name of *Catholicks*.

What new *Donatiſts*, Gentlemen, are you, to preſume to exclude us from this Character? And may we not juſtly demand of you, what S. *Auguſtine* once did of them on the ſame occaſion; "*You ſay that Chriſt is* "*Heir of no Lands, but where Donatus is Co-heir.* "*Read this to us out of the Law and the Prophets, out* "*of the Pſalms, out of the Goſpel, out of the Sacred E-* "*piſtles: Read it to us, and we will believe.*

De unitate Eccleſiæ, c. 6.

We

We accept the *Tradition* of Primitive Antiquity truly ſuch, with a Veneration we dare confidently ſay greater than your ſelves. We have ſhew'd, that the very grounds of our difference is, that you require us to believe and practiſe ſuch things as the Holy Scripture forbids us, and the Primitive Church never knew.

You command us *to worſhip Images:* Is it not evi- See Article 4.
dent, that both the Law and the Goſpel have forbid it? and is it not confeſs'd, that both the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors abhorred the very name?

You command us *to communicate only under one* Article 21.
kind: That is in our Opinion, nay, it is in yours too, to contradict the *Inſtitution* of our Bleſſed Saviour, and the practice of the very *Roman* Church for above a thouſand Years, and of all other Chriſtians to this very day.

You command us *to pray to Saints and Angels:* Does Article 3.
not St. *Paul* forbid it? Did not the *holy Angel* twice Col. 2. v. 18. Rev. 19. 10. refuſe it from St. *John?* And many Centuries paſs ——22. 9. without one probable Inſtance of any that did it?

You command us under pain of your *Anathema to* Article 19.
believe Tranſubſtantiation: Do you your ſelves underſtand what you mean by it? Is it any where written? Was it ever mention'd for above a thouſand Years?

You bid us *Adore the Holy Sacrament:* Has Chriſt Article 15.
preſcribed it? Have his holy Apoſtles written it? Did not here alſo above a thouſand Years paſs before any one attempted it?

You require us to believe the bleſſed Euchariſt *to be* Article 20.
a true and real Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins and ſatisfactions both of the Dead and of the Living. Have ye any probable proof of it? Are ye yet, or ever like to be agreed among your ſelves about it? Do not your own Principles evidently ſhew the contrary?

Men and Brethren: Consider, we conjure you these things: And if you please, consider us too, what we are, and what our Manners and Conversation among you has been: Believe us, at least, that we have no other End but Truth in these Enquiries: No other Interest but to save our Souls, and go the surest and directest way to Heaven.

The Proofs we offer, they are not vain Conjectures; they are clear, we think, convincing Arguments. And tho the design of this little Treatise has been rather to shew you what our Doctrine is, than to give a just account of those Reasons that detain us in it: Yet perhaps even in this there may be somewhat to shew, that we do not altogether build in the Air; but deserve certainly to have our *Articles* and our *Canons*, both better understood, and better answer'd, if it may be, than they have ever hitherto been.

For to resume yet once more some few of our differences.

Article 3. You think you ought *to Invocate the Blessed Virgin and the Holy Saints.* Now not to repeat what we have before said of the *Unlawfulness* of it, This we suppose to be first *needless*, because we know we have a more excellent and powerful Mediator, that has commandd us to come to him; and next *Uncertain*, because you are not able to tell us how, nay, not to secure us that by whatever way it be, our Prayers do always and certainly come up to them. If we are mistaken, at least we run no hazard in it: We address our selves continually to the Throne of Grace, where we are secure that we shall be both heard and answer'd. But now should you err, consider we beseech you how many Prayers you every day lose, and what a dishonour you put upon your divine Mediator. And if you please, consider too how unjust

unjuſt you are to damn us for not joyning with you in a practice, that has *ſo great danger, ſo little aſſurance, and not any advantage.*

You ſuppoſe we ought *to fall down before your Images.* Not to do this is to be ſure no Sin, you dare not ſay it is. To do it may be, and you can never ſecure us it is not, abominable *Idolatry*, odious to God, and contrary to that holy Faith into which we have been Baptized. Article 4.

You damn us for *doubting of the number of your ſeven Sacraments.* Has God revealed it to you? Have the Holy Scriptures defined it? Or even Tradition its ſelf delivered it to you. If it be true; Can you yet eſcape the charge of raſhneſs and uncharitableneſs, to damn whole Churches for ſo needleſs a matter? ſhould it be falſe, how will you eſcape that *Anathema* your ſelves; you have then ſo falſely as well as uncharitably denounced againſt us? Article 10.

You require us to believe *that Children dying unbaptized, are excluded the Grace of Chriſt for ever.* To what purpoſe this? For what benefit? Were it as evident as it is indeed uncertain, and we are perſwaded falſe; our modeſty ſafe in *deciding nothing*; the Errour of ſuch among us as believe it not is charitable; founded upon the ſure Mercies and Goodneſs of God, who never inflicts any Puniſhment where there is no fault; and in a word, has not any the leaſt ill conſequence upon it. We take as great care to baptize our Infants, as you can do who moſt believe it. But now, if your Opinion ſhould be falſe; What anſwer will you ever be able to make to God, for *peremptorily defining* what was *ſo uncertain and uncharitable?* and for damning us, only becauſe we dare not venture to cut off thoſe from Chriſt for whom he died, and whom we hope he will in Mercy receive to him? Article 10.

Laſtly,

Article 23. Laſtly, You deny us *the entire Communion*; you pronounce an *Anathema* againſt us, becauſe we will not confeſs that one part alone is ſufficient. Is it not certain that if we err, we have yet both Chriſt's Inſtitution, and the Practice and Opinion of many Ages to abſolve us? But have you any thing to excuſe you, if you are miſtaken? To take it as we do, you confeſs can have no danger; are you ſure that to deny it as you do, may not be a Sacriledge?

And what ſhall I ſay more? For the time would fail me to ſpeak of every one of thoſe *other Points* Monſieur *de Meaux* mentions, much more to add *many others*, and of no leſs conſequence, which he has thought fit to paſs by. In all which we have at leaſt this undeniable advantage over you; that beſides the cleareſt Arguments that we are in the right, the hazard we run is not very great if we ſhould not be: Whereas for you, neither is there any tolerable proof of the contrary Errours, and an infinite danger ſhould you chance to be miſtaken.

Theſe things, as both the Character of the Book we have now examined, and the Style of many other your latter moſt conſiderable Authors, give us cauſe to hope, begin to be no longer totally hid from your Eyes; ſo ſhall we never ceaſe in all our Prayers to make mention of you, that you may be perfectly enlightned to diſcern, and impartially diſpoſed, to receive and embrace the Truth.

In the mean time, whilſt both you and we mutually addreſs our ſelves to the *Eternal Truth* for his aſſiſtance; whilſt, as we ought, we implore his Mercy, that he would give us a right underſtanding in all things; remembring this that we are all but Men, and that it is not therefore impoſſible for either of us to err: That it may be ſtrength of Paſſion, or prejudice of Education,

tion, or even vehemency of Affection, more than the light of Reaſon, has hitherto kept us in a too fond partiality for our own Opinions: Let us at leaſt, we beſeech you, agree in that mutual Charity which alone can ſecure us amidſt all our Errors; which will both beſt diſpoſe God's Mercy to ſhew us what is right, and will beſt incline our Minds to that ſincerity which we all pretend to, and I hope all really have to embrace it.

If we cannot yet agree in all the Points of our Religion, let us conſider, that neither are the deareſt Friends entirely of the ſame opinion in every thing. Let us wait God's Pleaſure; if it be his will to *reveal even this alſo unto us: Nevertheleſs, whereunto we have already attain'd, let us walk by the ſame Rule, let us mind the ſame thing.* Phil. 3. 15, 16.

We believe in the ſame God; we rely on the ſame Redeemer; we embrace the ſame Creeds; we attend the ſame hopes of an Everlaſting Salvation: And in all theſe, amidſt all our other Differences, have at leaſt an entire agreement in what is *moſt neceſſary*, and ſhall we hope to the honeſt and ſincere among us, be *ſufficient for our Eternal Security.*

Let theſe things engage us to have the ſame love too: to be more ſparing in our *Anathema*'s, and more zealous in our *Prayers* for one another; to ſeek and to maintain the Truth, but to do it ſo as not to violate our Charity. In a word, whether we write, or ſpeak, to do both as *Men* who in a little time expect to be brought before a Divine Tribunal, where we muſt render a ſevere account for all theſe things; and one word ſpoken with this excellent Spirit, to cloſe thoſe Diviſions that ſo long have ſeparated us, ſhall be preferred to ten thouſand Volumes of endleſs and uncharitable Controverſies, that ſerve only to widen our Breaches, and heighten our Animoſities.

FINIS.